MODERN ROMANISM EXAMINED

BY THE

Rev. H. W. DEARDEN, M.A.

Introductory Notice by

Rev. R. SINKER, D.D.

Prefatory Note by

Bishop HANDLEY C. G. MOULE, D.D.

$19.00
6/22/18

MODERN ROMANISM EXAMINED

MODERN ROMANISM EXAMINED

BY THE

REV. H. W. DEARDEN, M.A.

WITH INTRODUCTORY NOTICE BY

REV. R. SINKER, D.D.

AND PREFATORY NOTE BY THE

RIGHT REV. H. C. G. MOULE, D.D.

BISHOP OF DURHAM

FOURTH EDITION.

LONDON

CHAS. THYNNE & JARVIS, LTD.

WHITEFRIARS STREET, FLEET STREET, E.C.4

MAY, 1927

First Edition, June 1899.
Second Edition. August 1899.
Third Edition, with New Prefatory Note, May 1909.
Fourth Edition, May 1927.

PREFATORY NOTE

By the Right Rev. H. C. G. MOULE, D.D.
BISHOP OF DURHAM

A POPULAR re-issue of Dearden's "Modern Romanism" is a timely enterprise, and one which should command large success.

The book belongs to that not large class of controversial works which bring to the difficult and painful process of religious debate a noble spirit of mingled decision and fairness which in itself educates the reader for right thinking.

From end to end of Mr. Dearden's book no really bitter word will be found, no attempt to snatch an advantage by logical or rhetorical devices, no sign that the writer forgets the sacred nature of the truths in debate, or the tenderness with which the minds and consciences of honest opponents should always be treated. And all this is so, while yet the book is a model of clearness of insight and decision of statement upon the anti-Roman side.

For myself, I know no work of its modest size which I would so confidently place in the hands of

a candid and earnest Roman Catholic who cared to hear the Protestant position stated at once definitely, fairly, and with genuine knowledge. Within my own experience such a case occurred a few years ago. A Romanist clergyman, now a devoted and laborious Anglican, was brought into close intercourse with me during the final stages of his transition. Most instructive to me was the way in which his keen and at the same time reverent mind found its rest in precisely the Protestantism of the English Prayer-Book and Articles, with its combined reverence for antiquity and allegiance to Scripture; its message of divine contact with God in Christ by faith, along with its inculcation of the sacredness of worship and the divine origin of the Sacraments. Had Mr. Dearden's book been in my hands at that time, I cannot doubt that I should have put it before my friend, and I seem to see the respect and satisfaction with which he would have read it. "Modern Romanism" is a work where, as nearly as possible, the reader will find equally good work everywhere. But the chapter on the Eucharist seems to me one of the best examples of the general goodness.

May God bless the message of the book. The advances of Roman influence in this country, at least on the surface, are formidable. The truest antidote is the right sort of knowledge presented in the right spirit. Therefore, Mr. Dearden's pages are timely.

To me there is a solemn personal pleasure in adding my God-speed to its issue. The writer was my dear and valued friend, as also was that great Reformation student and true saint, the Rev. N. Dimock. Their memory is indeed to me a blessed one. With humble thankfulness for their example, I commend this book to the thoughtful reader.

HANDLEY DUNELM.,
May, 1909.

PUBLISHERS' NOTE TO THE FOURTH EDITION.

The additional wording at the end of several chapters which have been placed in brackets, thus [ ], have been added to this Edition.

INTRODUCTORY NOTICE

To those whose memory can go back for forty or fifty years, it must be a very patent fact that in those days the line of demarcation between the Church of England and the Church of Rome in this country was one very strongly marked. Teachers on the Protestant side laid constant and emphatic stress on the points of difference between the two communions; so much so, in some cases, that there was a danger of this protesting side throwing into the background the great positive truths, and giving some colour to the taunt that, after all, Protestantism was but so much negation.

Yet the Church of England is as emphatically Catholic as she is Protestant, her teaching has as truly its positive as its negative side. Doubtless in great measure due to the realisation of this profound truth, the old state of things, too unmixedly polemic, has given place to one in which we realise alike the fundamental truths of Christianity which we and the Church of Rome hold in common, as well as the errors wherein, as we believe, the

Church of Rome has drifted away from the faith of the Primitive Church.

Still, while this broader and more enlightened view of matters is ground for thankfulness, the change involves elements which are not so satisfactory. It is certainly true, on the one hand, that a more Catholic view of English Protestantism has arisen during the last generation; it is unfortunately not less true that during the same period a general spirit of indifferentism in religious matters has manifested itself in a way which thoughtful men cannot but seriously deplore.

In this atmosphere of indifferentism the grave diversities of doctrine existing between the Church of England, as declared in her authorised formularies, and the Church of Rome—diversities which are such that the one Church or the other must be profoundly and grievously wrong—are too often treated as immaterial, as legitimate and non-essential differences of view of certain truths. That the differences, however, are not merely points for academic discussion, but matters affecting the central root of Christian faith and life, is what my friend Mr. Dearden has essayed to show, and, as I believe, has succeeded in showing with singular force and point, and with marked simplicity of treatment.

That many English Roman Catholics are pro-

foundly anxious and uneasy under the existing conditions of their religious life is a fact which it is impossible to minimise, and the recent religious upheavals in France and Austria shed a highly suggestive light on it. To an English Romanist, desiring to know for himself what basis to be found in Scripture, or in the teaching of the Primitive Church, this or that tenet of mediæval or modern Romanism can claim, Mr. Dearden's book will furnish seasonable help. It is neither polemical nor rhetorical; it is a simple statement of the ground, put, I think, always with singular fairness and courtesy, on which it is to be held that the Protestant-Catholic Church of England is right, and the Church of Rome wrong, and profoundly wrong.

But, I believe, the work will be found helpful not merely to the inquiring Romanist, who may thus, it is hoped, come in the long run to follow the example of the men of Berea, but also to Anglican Protestants who were drifting into the belief that, after all, the points of difference were of secondary moment.

To attempt even the briefest *résumé* of Mr. Dearden's work would be far beyond my purpose; let it suffice to point out three things wherein the difference between the Churches is fundamental, and where the Supreme Court of Appeal, the Bible, speaks with unequivocal voice.

(1.) No truth is taught in the New Testament with greater emphasis and greater plainness than that there is an unrestricted right of access for every Christian soul through Christ to its God and Father. No more unscriptural claim has ever been put forward than that of the individual priest to intervene, as with "the shadow of eclipse," between the soul and its God; nor, may we add, was any claim ever urged more subversive of the true constitution of a Christian home.

(2.) The Church of England teaches in her Prayer-Book and Articles that there is in the Holy Communion a Real Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ, but that it is a *subjective* and spiritual one. The Roman doctrine of transubstantiation, or, if you will, the doctrine of an *objective* and localised presence of the Body and Blood of Christ (for the difference between such phrases is, after all, but a subtle academic one) is one for which Scripture warrant is asked in vain, and for the origin of which we must go to a mediæval date.

(3.) If we accept the Bible as God's Word, then we are clearly bound to accept its testimony concerning itself; consequently the study of the Bible cannot be too strongly or too widely urged. We believe profoundly that among the causes to which England owes her greatness, her possession and use of the open Bible takes a high place. Yet

are not the restrictions placed on the use of it where the Roman Church holds sway patent enough? How little does use of the Scripture in the vernacular enter into the life of a modern Romanist. Nay, even so far as it is grudgingly allowed, in how unsatisfactory a form, loaded with all the imperfections of the Vulgate, is the Bible studied, when it is studied, by even an educated Roman Catholic.

Mr. Dearden's work is not the work of a theorist, deriving his points from the study of books alone. As a hardworking parish clergyman, in London and elsewhere, he was constantly brought into contact with inquiring Romanists, and his experience of many cases taught him alike the lines of difficulty felt by thoughtful men and women among them, and the arguments and facts which were found most efficacious in bringing home the truth to their minds.

As a temperate statement of present-day Romanism, alike free from attempts at accentuation or at minimising, I warmly commend Mr. Dearden's work, and most heartily hope and anticipate for it a large measure of usefulness.

R. SINKER.

TRINITY COLLEGE,
May 27, 1899.

AUTHOR'S PREFACE

It is not perhaps generally borne in mind that, previous to the year 1850, Protestants and Romanists were living together in England without any visible signs of antagonism or aggressiveness on either side. Englishmen were satisfied, convinced of the truth of their faith as set forth at the Reformation, and the Romanists amongst them were quiet and contented with the free enjoyment of their worship and civil liberties. But with the introduction of the Roman Hierarchy in the year 1850 this peace was suddenly broken. The new Roman leaders were for the most part controversialists, and, aided by secessions caused by the Tractarian movement, numbered amongst them men of undoubted ability. The English people, so long undisturbed, were not prepared for attacks which had ages ago been silenced, and were unexpectedly called upon to look to the foundations and reasons of their Reformed faith. Rome boldly accused England of heresy and of belonging to Churches which were excommunicate and beyond the pale of salvation. Much religious excitement

naturally followed. This was increased by the publication, by authority, of two new doctrines—the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary—including, of course, her perfect sinlessness—in 1854, and of the Infallibility of the Pope in 1870—two doctrines so momentous that it is more reasonable to suppose that, if true, they would have been plainly set forth in the pages of the New Testament and perpetually referred to from the earliest history of the Church, than that they should have been withheld by the Holy Ghost for nearly nineteen centuries.

It is not to be wondered at that some were at first carried away by arguments and assertions to which they were unprepared to reply; but presently many returned to the fold of their fathers, sorrowful and disappointed by their short experience of Rome's demands. As might be expected, the interest caused by these aggressive movements and novel doctrines was not restricted to Protestants. By degrees an inquiring spirit was developed among Romanists, especially among the laity. The Roman bishops admit that their educated laymen are reading English works on divinity and that there is a continual leakage from their communion. In spite of the great addition of monasteries, nunneries, seminaries, and the multiplication of priests—largely supported by foreign contributions—the relative number of Romanists does not increase. Many are dissatisfied

with the novel doctrines and claims of the Papacy; they are also justly annoyed at the bitter spirit exhibited by the hierarchy and the Curia towards England. They are brought in contact, through present controversies, with truths which they had long ignored, and of which, for the most part, they had been profoundly ignorant, with the result that many are quietly joining the Reformed Churches, whilst others are seeking by prayer and deeper study for light and certainty.

This book has been prepared with a double aim—that it may strengthen those who hold the "*faith which was once for all delivered to the saints*" (Jude 3, R.V.), and assist those sincere inquirers among our Romanist fellow-Christians who are dissatisfied with the additions made to the Catholic Creeds by the twelve articles of the Creed of Pius IV. (A.D. 1564), and by the two new dogmas recently enforced upon them under pain of anathema.

Two points of explanation are offered to the reader:—1st, That the members of the Reformed and Roman Churches are spoken of respectively as PROTESTANTS and ROMANISTS, both being equally "Catholic." The word Protestant is employed according to its original use at the Diet of Spires (A.D. 1529), that is, to signify those who hold the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds, but protest against the interference of the Pope in matters of religion. It was thus

used by Bishop Cosin and Archbishop Laud—the latter declaring immediately before his death, "I have always lived in the Protestant religion established in England, and in that I am now come to die." The word is distinctly *positive* as to scriptural truth, *negative* only in regard to error. 2ndly, That whenever D. is appended to a quotation from the Bible, it signifies that it is taken from the Douay or Roman Catholic Version; when R.V. is appended, it implies that the Revised Version is adopted.

The writer takes this opportunity of expressing his grateful thanks to the Rev. Dr. Sinker, the learned Librarian of Trinity College, Cambridge, and to the Rev. N. Dimock, the author of so many able books on the Eucharist, for their invaluable suggestions and help during the progress of this work.

CAMBRIDGE, *June* 1899.

SECOND EDITION

THE writer acknowledges with sincere thanks the valuable criticisms of several correspondents. Many of these have been adopted in this New Edition, so far as they seemed to be amendments; none of them affected the general arguments of the work.

CAMBRIDGE, *August* 1899.

BOOKS QUOTED OR ALLUDED TO IN THIS WORK.

Title.	*Author.*	*Publisher.*
Articles, XXXIX.	Bishop H. Browne.	Parker.
Articles, XXIX.	Green.	Gardner.
Apocrypha.	Wace.	Murray.
Bellum Papale; or, Corruption of the Fathers.	Thom. Jambs.	London (1606).
Butler's Analogy.	Fitzgerald's Ed.	Orr & Co.
Catholic Belief.	Di Bruno.	Burns & Oates.
Catholic Controversy.	Ryder.	Burns & Oates.
Catholic Dictionary.	Addis, &c., 4th ed.	Kegan Paul & Co.
Catholic Historical Papers.	Various.	21 Westminster Bridge.
Catholic Tracts.	Various.	21 Westminster Bridge
Christian Antiquities.	W. Smith, &c.	Murray.
Christian Ministry (Philippians).	Bishop Lightfoot.	Macmillan.
Church Historical Tracts.	Various.	S.P.C.K,
Controversial Catechism.	Keenan.	Burns.
Cosin on the Church, &c.		Surtees Society.
Dangerous Deceits.	N. Dimock.	G. Stock.
Documents of English Church.	Haddan and Stubbs.	Macmillan.
England and Rome.	Scudamore.	Rivingtons.
England *versus* Rome.	H. B. Swete.	Rivingtons.
England's Danger.	Horton.	Clark.
End of Controversy.	Milner.	Duffy.
Eirenicon.	Pusey.	Parkers.
Faith of Our Fathers.	Gibbons.	Burns.
Features of Modern Romanism.		S.P.C.K.
Glories of Mary.	Liguori.	Burns.
Growth of Sacrificial Ideas.	Morris	Longmans.
Growth of the Papacy.	Robertson.	S.P.C.K.
History of England.	Lingard.	Dolman.
History of the Christian Church.	Robertson.	Murray.
History of the Church.	Palmer.	Rivingtons.
History of the Council of Trent.	Froude.	
History of the Papacy.	Creighton.	Longmans.
Holy Bible.	Douay Version.	Art and Book Company.

Title.	*Author.*	*Publisher.*
Indulgences.	A. M. Lépicier.	Kegan Paul & Co.
Infallibility of the Church.	Salmon.	Murray.
Immaculate Conception, Little Order of.		Cath. Pub. Co.
Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary.	Harper.	Longmans.
Invitation Heeded.	Stone.	New York.
Jewel's Apology.		S.P.C.K.
Joseph, Who is?	Cardinal Vaughan.	Burns.
Letters to a Seceder.	Scudamore.	Rivingtons.
Manning, Life of.	Purcell.	
Manual of the Sacred Heart.		Burns.
Plain Reasons, &c.	Littledale.	S.P.C.K.
Protestation of English Romanists.		S.P.C.K.
Roman Catholic Claims.	Gore.	Longmans.
Roman Mass.	Dimock.	Stock.
Romanism.	Jenkins.	R.T.S.
Sacerdotium.	Dimock.	Stock.
Sovereign Pontiff.	Maurel.	Duffy.
Temporal Mission of Holy Ghost.	Manning.	Longmans.
Threshold of Catholic Church.	Bagshawe.	Washbourne.
Trent, Council of.	Froude.	Longmans.
Westcott's Epistle to Hebrews.		Macmillan.
Westcott's S. John's Gospel.		Murray.
Wiseman, Reply to.	Cumming.	Shaw.
Worship of Virgin Mary.	Tyler.	S.P.C.K.

CONTENTS

PART I

QUESTIONS BEARING UPON THE PAPAL THEORY OF THE CHURCH OF ROME

CHAP.		PAGE
I.	THE THEORY OF THE PAPACY	3
II.	THE FOUNDATION OF THE THEORY, OR THE SUPPOSED PRIMACY OF ST. PETER	6
III.	THE THEORY A FAILURE AS TO THE TEMPORAL SOVEREIGNTY OF THE POPE	21
IV.	THE THEORY A FAILURE AS REGARDS THE PRESERVATION OF VISIBLE UNITY IN THE CHURCH	27
V.	CHRIST'S PRAYER FOR UNITY	33
VI.	THE THEORY A FAILURE AS REGARDS THE TEACHING OF TRUTH	37
VII.	THE COMPLETION OF THE THEORY: THE INFALLIBILITY OF THE POPE	43
VIII.	INFALLIBILITY "À PRIORI"	54
IX.	ROME'S CLAIM TO EXCLUSIVE CATHOLICITY	61
X.	THE RISE AND GROWTH OF THE PAPACY	66

PART II

QUESTIONS BEARING UPON ROMAN ERRORS AS FORMULATED IN THE CREED OF POPE PIUS IV. AND THE NEW DOGMA OF THE IMMACULATE CONCEPTION

CHAP.		PAGE
XI.	THE CREED OF POPE PIUS IV. AND THE COUNCIL OF TRENT	79
XII.	ROME'S RESTRICTED USE OF THE BIBLE	83
XIII.	THE CANONICAL BOOKS AND THE APOCRYPHA	95
XIV.	TRADITION OF EQUAL AUTHORITY WITH SCRIPTURE	101
XV.	THE SEVEN SACRAMENTS	107
XVI.	PENANCE	112
XVII.	THE EUCHARIST (TRANSUBSTANTIATION)	125
XVIII.	THE SACRIFICE OF THE MASS	140
XIX.	A SACRIFICIAL PRIESTHOOD	154
XX.	THE TRUE DOCTRINE OF THE EUCHARIST	158
XXI.	COMMUNION IN ONE KIND	166
XXII.	TRAFFIC IN MASSES	172
XXIII.	JUSTIFICATION AND SANCTIFICATION	177
XXIV.	WORKS OF MERIT AND SUPEREROGATION	187
XXV.	FUTURE REWARDS	192
XXVI.	PURGATORY	195
XXVII.	NO EVIDENCE FOR PURGATORY	203

CHAP. PAGE

XXVIII. THE INVOCATION OF SAINTS 210

XXIX. MARIOLATRY 222

XXX. THE IMMACULATE CONCEPTION 236

XXXI. ROME'S APOLOGY FOR MARIOLATRY . . . 242

XXXII. SAFEGUARDS AGAINST MARIOLATRY . . . 250

XXXIII. HOW PROTESTANTS REGARD THE VIRGIN MARY . 254

XXXIV. THE INVOCATION OF ANGELS 265

XXXV. THE VENERATION OF IMAGES AND RELICS . . 269

XXXVI. INDULGENCES 280

XXXVII. UNCERTAINTY OF INDULGENCES . . . 289

XXXVIII. ROME'S ARGUMENTS FOR INDULGENCES . . 293

XXXIX. DOCTRINE OF INTENTION 298

PART III

SOME QUESTIONS OF THE DAY CONNECTED WITH MODERN ROMANISM

XL. NEW DEVOTIONS AND MODES OF WORSHIP . . 305

XLI. DEVELOPMENT 320

XLII. MORALS AND SANCTITY 325

XLIII. IS ROMANISM ADVANCING? 333

XLIV. REASON AND CONSCIENCE 340

XLV. A "LIVING VOICE" 347

XLVI. WHAT GOOD HAS ROMANISM DONE IN THE PAST? 353

CHAP. PAGE

XLVII. PRESENT ATTITUDE OF ROME TOWARDS ENGLISH PROTESTANTISM 358

XLVIII. IS ROME BEING REFORMED FROM WITHIN? . . 362

XLIX. ROME'S ENGLISH MARTYRS 365

L. ALLEGED FAILURES OF PROTESTANTISM . . 369

LI. ALLEGED IMMORAL EFFECTS OF THE REFORMATION 375

PART IV

SOME POPULAR ROMAN FALLACIES

LII. POPERY ON EVERY COIN OF THE REALM . . 381

LIII. ENGLAND CONVERTED BY ROMAN MISSIONARIES . 383

LIV. ENGLAND OWES SUBJECTION TO ROME . . . 386

LV. THE PRESENT CHURCH OF ENGLAND A NEW CHURCH —HER PROPERTY BELONGS TO ROME . . 390

LVI. RELIGION OF KING HENRY VIII. 392

LVII. THE SOVEREIGN THE HEAD OF THE CHURCH . 394

CONCLUSION 396

INDEX 407

PART I

QUESTIONS BEARING UPON THE PAPAL THEORY OF THE CHURCH OF ROME

MODERN ROMANISM EXAMINED

I

THE THEORY OF THE PAPACY[1]

Question.—Is not the theory of Rome a magnificent conception?—that Christ appointed a Vicar and visible Head over His Church upon earth, that St. Peter was the first Pope, that the Popes in all ages have been his successors, each endowed with the gift of infallibility and authority over the whole Church of Christ, so that all questions as to doctrine or morals can be settled at once, without the anxiety and responsibility which attend the exercise of private judgment? And the Pope's claim to be king and ruler over all the kings and nations of the world, would it not, if allowed, put an end to war

[1] The Greek word *pappas*, Latin *papa*, modern *pope*, means a *father*, and was originally applied to all ecclesiastics. It was gradually restricted to bishops, and the Greek bishops are called *popes* to the present day. Pope Gregory VII. forbade its application to any but the Bishop of Rome. Papacy signifies the office and government of the Papa, or Pope, of Rome.

and produce universal peace? Is not this what we might expect from the design of God to reconcile the world through Christ unto Himself, and remedy all the evil which sin had made?

A.—Doubtless the theory is a most attractive one, but, like many other theories and speculations, it proves upon examination as empty as it is alluring, as baseless as it is fascinating. All imaginations as to what *might* be, or dreams as to what God might be *expected to do*, are presumptuous and dangerous. By similar *à priori* reasoning, as it is called, we might imagine and expect that sin and suffering would never be allowed to mar God's world; that He would never tolerate the vice and crime and poverty and oppression and anguish which cry from the earth for vengeance, like the blood of Abel; that if He purposed to save and sanctify mankind, He would do it quickly and universally, and not suffer generations of men to live and die without even hearing the name of the incarnate Son of God, or of the tidings of salvation by the Cross. This, and a hundred other beautiful and attractive conceptions we might form with equal justice of how the world *ought* to have been governed, of how we might *expect* it to be so dealt with that it should know no sorrow and be filled with uninterrupted joy.

Bishop Butler long ago answered all such speculations of imaginative minds who argue that things *must* be, or *ought* to be, because they *wish* or *expect* them to

be. Alluding to these "emendations and imaginary improvements upon the system of God," he goes on to say: "It seems there would be no stopping till we came to some such conclusions as these—that all creatures should at first be made as perfect and as happy as they were capable of ever being; that nothing, to be sure, of hazard or danger should be put upon them to do; that they should always do what was right, &c. &c." Then truly calling such thoughts a "train of folly and extravagance," he justly remarks that "we have not faculties for this kind of speculation," and advises that "instead of that idle and not very innocent employment of forming imaginary models of a world (or of a Church), and schemes of governing it," we should "turn our thoughts to what we EXPERIENCE to be the conduct of Nature (*i.e.* of God) with respect to intelligent creatures."[1] Such human conceptions, be they ever so ingenious and magnificent, are nothing in the presence of the FACTS of history and the FACTS of God's providence, of which history and experience are the records.

[1] Butler's "Analogy," the Introduction.

II

THE FOUNDATION OF THE THEORY, OR THE SUPPOSED PRIMACY OF ST. PETER

Q.—Is not the Roman theory founded upon the words of our Lord to St. Peter, "*I say unto thee, That thou art Peter; and upon this rock I will build My Church*"? (Matt. xvi. 18, Douay); and does not this imply that the Popes of Rome, as the successors of St. Peter, are the rulers of the whole Church on earth by Divine right?

A.—This claim to the government of the universal Church, so amazing for its boldness and its rashness, is indeed made by Rome. Art. XI. of the Creed of Pius IV. declares, "I acknowledge the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Roman Church to be the mother and mistress of all Churches"; and Art. XII. further exacts the profession, "I vow and swear a true obedience to the Roman pontiff, the successor of St. Peter, the prince of the apostles and the Vicar of Jesus Christ"—each under peril of anathema. Bellarmine, the great Roman controversialist, asserts, "Roman Catholics affirm that the Apostle Peter was appointed by Christ the head

and prince of the whole Church in the room of Christ Himself,"[1] and says of the dogma, "On this doctrine the whole of Christianity depends." A modern writer, who usually minimises Roman doctrine in order to conciliate Protestants, puts this plainly before the convert, "that you submit your judgment on all religious matters to the decisions which she (the Roman Church) has given, and to all those which she may hereafter give; and that you acknowledge the Roman Catholic Church to have a right, given by God, to *command you in all that relates to your salvation.*"[2]

These statements should be weighed solemnly; the constant assumption should be noticed that the universal Church of Christ signifies only the Roman Church. It should be considered how these claims invade and, if it were possible, curtail the headship of Christ over multitudes of saintly souls in all ages; how they affect more than half the Christians now living in the world; how they oppose the action and liberty of the Holy Ghost, who is a "free spirit,"[3] *i.e.* unfettered, and also the fulness and freeness of Christ's salvation, which is promised to every repentant sinner; how it claims for a Church that personal responsibility of the soul which is alone due to God. Such reflection will be sufficient to

[1] De Rom. Pont., i. 10.
[2] Bagshawe's "Threshold of the Catholic Church," 59.
[3] Ps. li. 12.

overthrow these groundless pretensions from very loyalty to Christ, and from regard to the world-wide intentions of His love, and to the simple conditions of salvation as summed up by St. Paul, "*Repentance toward God and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ.*" If on *this doctrine* of St. Peter's primacy *the whole of Christianity depends*, reason demands—Why then was it not revealed in Scripture as clearly as the Incarnation or the Divinity of Christ, or His sacrifice for sin? History also demands, Why was it not proclaimed in the general councils of the primitive Church? Why this silence? Surely because it had no place in the mind of God, or in the teaching of the Fathers.

Two distinct dogmas are included in the teaching of Rome upon this subject—(1) that our Lord gave to St. Peter not only precedence in honour over the other apostles, but an authority and jurisdiction which constituted him their teacher and ruler by Divine right; and (2) that this prerogative or privilege was not solely *personal*, but a right and power which was to be *handed down to his successors* in the see of Rome. Each of these dogmas is inconsistent with the language of our Lord, the usage of the apostles, and the practice of the early Church. Apply these tests to the first dogma relative to St. Peter:—

1st. THE TEACHING OF JESUS CHRIST.—Three sayings of Christ to St. Peter are constantly quoted by Romanists—"*Thou art Peter, and upon this rock*

I will build My Church" (Matt. xvi. 18, D.); "*I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not: and thou being once converted, confirm thy brethren*" (Luke xxii. 32, D.); and the commission, "*Feed My sheep*" (John xxi. 16, 17, D.).

As regards the first of these passages, had it not been for the prejudices of controversy, probably few would have questioned that our Lord's words to St. Peter conferred much favour and distinction upon him as a great foundation-stone in the building up of the Christian Church. A metaphor can be used in many varied applications. As regards the basis, the source, the life-imparting principle to the whole Church, there can be no question as to St. Paul's assertion that "*No one can lay another foundation but that which is laid, which is Christ Jesus*" (1 Cor. iii. 11, D.). But in other applications referring to saints as "*living stones*" (1 Peter ii. 5, D.) gathered into the spiritual temple by Christ's servants, the same apostle could write, "*You are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief corner-stone*" (Eph. ii. 20, D).; and St. John writes (Rev. xxi. 14, D.), "*The wall of the city had twelve foundations, and in them the twelve names of the twelve apostles of the Lamb.*" Such a foundation-stone was eminently St. Peter. At a critical time in our Lord's ministry it was the will of the Father[1] to enlighten

[1] "Flesh and blood hath not revealed it to thee, but My Father who is in heaven" (Matt. xvi. 17, D.).

him as to the dignity of His Son, Jesus Christ. The confession, "*Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God,*" marks a distinct progress of spiritual apprehension in the apostolic company.

Well then might our Lord single out the speaker for His praise and approbation. More than this it is impossible to draw from the passage, and the attempt to do so meets in a remarkable manner with our Lord's own instant condemnation. St. Peter proved himself almost immediately to be no rock, no infallible foundation for the Christian Church, by his inability to understand Christ's words respecting His suffering and death, and by the rashness of his rebuke to his Divine Master. The severest reprimand recorded in Scripture to any of God's servants followed (Matt. xvi. 23, R.V.): "*Get thee behind Me, Satan: thou art a stumbling-block unto Me: for thou mindest not the things of God, but the things of men.*"

The passages in Luke xxii. and John xxi. have no reference to any dignity pertaining to St. Peter, but, on the contrary, only to his *fall* and to the Master's pitying and loving restoration. What more natural than that the one who fell most deeply should be called upon, when mercifully restored, most strongly to help to restore and strengthen the brethren whom he had misled? The thrice-repeated question recorded in John xxi., "*Lovest thou Me?*" with the bitter sorrow which it caused, can only have an

honest interpretation in its reference to the humiliating fact that he had thrice denied his Lord. No stress can be laid upon one of the Greek words translated "*Feed* (poimaine) *My sheep*," as if its possible meaning, *tend* or *shepherd* conferred any authority upon St. Peter, as it was a common ministerial word, used, *e.g.* by St. Paul when he addressed the Ephesian elders at Miletus, and called upon them to "*feed* (same word, *poimainein*) *the Church of God*." Christ would indeed restore the disciple to his office, but only on the conditions of discipline and repentance.

This interpretation follows from other words and actions of our Lord. Had He proposed that a primacy of authority and rule should belong to St. Peter, why did He not settle the frequent disputes which arose among the disciples as to "*who should be the greatest*," by saying that He had given that honour to Peter? Why not give that reply to the mother of James and John when she sought the highest places for them? Why check their human ambition to be called "Rabbi" by the caution "*For all ye are brethren*"?

The same silence, or more than silence, may be noticed in the whole history of the apostle. St. Peter does not send apostles to Samaria, but is sent. St. Peter does not preside at the Council of Jerusalem, but St. James. The lists of Church officers and functions always begin "First apostles,"

never "first St. Peter." His special work was not to be the head of the whole Church, but only the apostle of the circumcision (Gal. ii. 7, D.). St. Paul went up to Jerusalem and stayed with St. Peter fifteen days, but his remark upon that visit was, "*They who were of repute imparted nothing to me*" (Gal. ii. 6, R.V.); and in the same chapter (v. 11) he relates how when Peter came to Antioch, "*I resisted him to the face because he stood condemned*" (R.V.). Surely in all this there are no traces of St. Peter's superior authority and rule. The same conclusion follows from the Pastoral Epistles, in which the duties of the clergy are explained and their relation to each other carefully laid down, but in which there is no reference to St. Peter; also, from the letters to the Seven Churches in the Apocalypse, in which the Churches are treated separately and locally without any allusion to a supreme head as representing Christ, or having any authority over them. The Lord Jesus Christ has not renounced the supreme government of His Church. He is still the "*Head of the body, the Church*" (Col. i. 18, D.), and that with an individuality of omniscient power and love, for "*The Head of* EVERY *man is Christ*" (1 Cor. xi. 3, D.). But as the Father hath committed all judgment unto the Son without sacrificing His own dignity, so the Son, in union with the Father, has provided "another Comforter (or Paraclete)" to administer the pre-

sent economy of our salvation (John xv. 26), who "abides" with Christ's Church, collectively and individually, until the spiritual kingdom is complete. Christ's vicar, by His own declaration, is not the Pope, but the Holy Spirit.

Clearly the claims of the Papacy have no support from Holy Scripture.

And to the second dogma, that St. Peter was to have SUCCESSORS endowed with the imaginary powers attributed to the apostle, not the slightest hint of any such intended succession is given in the New Testament. Wherever in the Bible an official succession is designed, an express mention is always stated. So the promises to Abraham are expressly recorded as pertaining to his "*seed after him*" (Gen. xvii. 7, 8, 10): the priesthood of Aaron was to have an official succession, and accordingly it is clearly *commanded* (Num. xviii. 1–8): the kingship of David was to continue in his line, and the promise is *made known* (2 Sam. vii. 12–16). But no such direction is mentioned on this important matter of succession to St. Peter, proving that it has no scriptural warrant or foundation.

TESTIMONY OF THE FATHERS.—The Fathers were not infallible men, but their testimony is useful in showing the judgment of the early Church upon the texts brought forward in favour of St. Peter's primacy and the supposed succession. They are here quoted in relation to the two dogmas, as

the same passages frequently apply to both. The appeal will be the stronger if Rome's own canon is borne in mind — "Nor will I ever receive or interpret them (the Scriptures) except according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers" (2nd Art. Creed of Pius IV.). When such unanimity does not exist, the opinion of the greatest number must carry the most weight. Take the passage most relied upon by Rome, "*Thou art Peter* (petros), *and upon this Rock* (petra) *I will build My Church*" (Matt. xvi. 18). On this text, according to a Roman Catholic writer, Archbishop Kenrich of St. Louis, forty-four Fathers consider the "rock" to signify the "*faith*" which St. Peter confessed, sixteen *Christ Himself*, and seventeen apply the "rock" to St. Peter; so that there are sixty Fathers against seventeen as to its personal application to St. Peter. The language of Origen (A.D. 234) upon the text is very striking: "If we speak as Peter did, 'Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God,' not as flesh and blood reveals, but the light shining into our heart from the Father, we become Peter, and to us it would be said by the Word, 'Thou art Peter, and on this rock I will build My Church.' For the term 'rock' applies to every disciple of Christ." So St. Cyprian (A.D. 258) frequently quotes the passage to defend the rights of bishops, claiming that each bishop received the gifts that were given to St. Peter, but never

quotes the text in support of the Roman claims.[1] St. Augustine, at the beginning of the fifth century, wrote his mature conclusions on this and other questions, and inclines to the view that the passage relates to Christ Himself, led by the text, "*That rock was Christ*," and "*Other foundation can no man lay*"; but leaves his readers at liberty to judge. Evidently the Church had not then adopted Rome's interpretation. And it is important to notice that those who considered the rock to mean St. Peter, as Tertullian, contend that the privilege conferred by Christ was exclusively *personal* and fulfilled by the part St. Peter took in the formation of the Church on the day of Pentecost, and by the baptism of the Gentile Cornelius.

Upon the passage, "*I have prayed for thee*," &c., St. Chrysostom says it is because his presumption, as indicated by his self-confident profession of loyalty, required rebuke,[2] "He (Christ) said this, sharply rebuking him, and showing that his fall was more grievous than the others and needed more assistance." As to the attempt to argue any precedency for St. Peter from the command in John xxi. directing him to feed the flock, "*My sheep*" and

[1] Some Romanists quote as from St. Cyprian, "Primatus Petro datur," "*the Primacy is given to Peter*," &c.; but it has been abundantly proved that the words are an interpolation. See Hartel's edition, *De Cath. Eccl. Unitate*, c. 4, p. 213, and James' "Concordia-Corruption of the True Fathers."

[2] Homily in St. Matthew xxvi.

"*My lambs*," it is quite contrary to the testimony of the Fathers, as it is to any rational interpretation. No instance in favour of it can be found before St. Bernard (about A.D. 1150), when the Papal monarchy was already established by Hildebrand. Thus St. Ambrose (A.D. 397) says: "By feeding Christ's flock well with the food of faith, he did away with the guilt of his former fall. And for that reason he is thrice enjoined to feed, is thrice asked if he loves the Lord, that he may thrice confess Him Whom he had thrice denied before the Cross" (De Fide, v. 2). So St. Augustine says: "Therefore He saith to Peter, whom He would make a good shepherd, not in Peter's own person, but in that of His body, 'Peter, lovest thou Me? Feed My sheep?' He said this once, twice, thrice, to Peter's sorrow." Again he writes: "A threefold confession repays the threefold denial." St. Cyril of Alexandria (444) takes the same view: "Through the thrice-repeated confession of the blessed Peter was annulled his sin in thrice denying; and through our Lord saying, 'Feed My lambs,' there is conceived to be a sort of restoration of the apostolate already given to him."

These quotations are proofs that the Fathers did not regard the texts usually relied upon by Romanists as giving any supremacy of government, or rule, or infallible teaching to St. Peter. They speak in strong terms of his personal pre-eminence,

and not infrequently apply to him the title of head and prolocutor of the apostolic body. But St. James and St. John and St. Paul receive titles as imposing. Thus St. Chrysostom styles St. Paul the "apostle of the world," "the planter of the Church," "the foundation of the faith," "the pillar and ground of the truth." Indeed, wherever "the apostle" occurs in their writings, it denotes St. Paul, not St. Peter. It is evident that they did not believe in St. Peter's supremacy.

Relation of the Church of Rome to other Churches.—As the Fathers did not believe in the supremacy of St. Peter, so neither did the early Church believe in the supremacy of the Church of Rome. The early Church recognised a pre-eminence in the See of Rome and its bishop much as the Anglican Churches throughout the world acknowledge the pre-eminence of the See of Canterbury—much for the same reasons, on account of antiquity and position. These circumstances confer a prestige and an influence not arising from Divine right, but from custom and the honour considered to be justly due. But as the Churches of the United States, of Canada, Australasia and the Cape, or the missionary Churches in various parts of the Empire, would resent commands and dogmas passed as by authority from Canterbury, so the early Churches of Christendom recognised a similar relation to the bishop of the imperial city of Rome

—a similar respect, but also a similar independence. Thus when Stephen of Rome excommunicated Cyprian of Carthage and Firmilian of Cæsarea, both resented the action of Rome's bishop. Cyprian wrote: "None of us styles himself bishop of bishops, or forces his colleagues to obedience by dread of his tyranny, since every bishop is free to act as he will according to the liberty and power which belong to him." Firmilian rebuked Stephen solemnly and severely: "How mighty a sin hast thou (Stephen) heaped to thyself in cutting thyself off from so many flocks! For do not deceive thyself: it is thou who hast cut off thine own self. He is the real schismatic who makes himself an apostate from the Church's unity." The words might have been written to the Rome of the present day, so strikingly are they applicable. The same resistance to similar interference on the part of Pope Celestine was made, and with corresponding success, by the African bishops of the fifth century. To these may be added the words of St. Jerome, the author of the Latin Vulgate, when he saw the ambition of the Roman See to over-reach the less wealthy Churches: "The custom of the Roman Church has no more authority than the custom of any other Church. The episcopate at Rome has no more authority essentially than any other episcopate. If it is a question of authority, the world is greater than the city. . . . The power of wealth or the

humility of poverty do not make a bishop higher or lower." To the credit of Pope Gregory I., at the close of the sixth century, let his protest be recorded: "My fellow-priest, John (of Constantinople), would fain be called 'universal bishop.' Priests seek for themselves ambitious names and glory in new and profane titles."

Thus the Scriptures, the Fathers, and for six centuries the Churches of Christ in various countries, and even Rome itself, acknowledged no supremacy in the Popes by Divine right.[1] A Romish writer,[2] perplexed by want of evidence, appeals to what he calls the "fact of the supremacy"; but the *fact* never existed. The Greek Church never admitted the dogma, and at the present time more than half Christendom ignores the empty boast.[3] The same writer goes on to say, "God's words are proved by their results." The *results* in this case are far from encouraging to the Roman claims, since her power and influence have diminished century by century, and the *relative* diminution still goes on. The unbiassed reader will come to different conclusions—(1) that the Roman theory is without Scriptural or primitive authority; (2) that Rome seldom *interprets* Holy Scripture, but that when she has built up a dogma or system from ambition, expediency, or other motives, she endeavours to *accommodate* Scripture to its sup-

[1] Gore's "Roman Claims." [2] "The Invitation," by Stone.
[3] See chap. x., p. 66.

port; and (3) that the Roman theory, however fascinating as a dream of genius and imagination, cannot fully satisfy the soul seeking after God. It is "*as when an hungry man dreameth, and, behold, he eateth; but he awaketh, and his soul is empty: or as when a thirsty man dreameth, and, behold, he drinketh; but he awaketh, and, behold, he is faint, and his soul hath appetite*" (Isa. xxix. 8).

If a man is seeking only for a Church and a system, the Church of Rome may prove the most attractive to such an one by reason of its outward pomp and ceremonial, its adaptation to and compliance with the fallen nature of man. But if a soul contrite under the felt burden of sin is seeking God's way of peace, God's way of salvation, deliverance from guilt and from the power of evil, he will, like St. Augustine, turn from earthly systems to the revealed Christ, to a personal Saviour; he will ground his hopes of Divine acceptance upon the supreme Head of all the Churches and the fountain of all grace, even upon Christ crucified and Christ glorified.

The Roman theory is essentially a human conception, a kingdom of this world, a Papacy, not the kingdom of God, a complicated delusive substitute for the revealed simplicity and perfection of the Divine love manifested in the Divine Son.

III

THE THEORY A FAILURE AS TO THE TEMPORAL SOVEREIGNTY OF THE POPE

Q.—How have the facts of history contradicted the Papal theory of the Temporal Sovereignty of the Pope?

A.—Had the theory of the temporal sovereignty been designed by God, there would doubtless have been a clear revelation of it in the New Testament. But the only reference made by our Lord to temporal power on the part of His Church was to *repudiate* it. When the Pharisees endeavoured to arouse the jealousy of Pilate by representing the Lord Jesus as a rival—making "himself a king"—the reply of the Saviour was, "*My kingdom is not of this world*" (John xviii. 36, D.). Peter's misapprehension as to our Lord's words respecting the sword was checked by the rebuke, "*Put up again thy sword into its place. For all that take the sword shall perish with the sword*" (Matt. xxvi. 52, D.).

Whatever was the origin of the theory, it was human, not Divine. The Church of Christ knew nothing of it for more than six centuries. When

John, Bishop of Constantinople, with true Eastern exaggeration, began to assume the title of universal bishop, he was denounced in no measured terms by Gregory the Great, at that time Bishop of Rome.[1] But in the ninth century the idea of a spiritual and temporal pre-eminence in the Roman bishop found a voice in Nicholas I. (A.D. 858), and a support in the forged Isidorian Decretals. The immediate effect of this was to increase the existing jealousies between the Bishops of Rome and Constantinople, and to produce that separation between the Eastern and Western, or, as we should now say, between the Greek and Roman Churches, which continues to this day. Thus the *first* effect of the theory was to produce *disruption and schism.* The theory was rejected by the Eastern Church, and could only work in the Roman Communion, so that from the very beginning it was restricted to a portion only of Christendom.

Once accepted by the Popes, it grew rapidly in those "ages of darkness," as they are truly called. It reached its height under Innocent III., who had the audacity to declare that "Christ had committed the whole world to the government of the Popes," and in his Bull "Unam Sanctam" he asserted, "It is altogether *necessary to salvation* that every human creature should be subject to the Roman Pontiff." This Bull was the first addressed to the whole world.

[1] See chap. x., p. 70.

The temporal sovereignty declined from the time of Pope Boniface VIII. But in those years what injury the theory wrought upon true religion! What desolation in ten thousands of homes! The claim to temporal sovereignty required territory for its support. Thus the Roman Church was changed into a Curia—a Court; its bishop into a monarch, the mitre into a tiara—a triple crown; apostolic simplicity into regal magnificence and expenditure. With this grew the temptation to employ the spiritual power to temporal ends. The Popes favoured those monarchs who would increase their Italian domains—the States of the Church, as they were presently called. Wars between secular princes were abetted to increase the authority and aggrandise the riches of the Papacy. The lands of a disobedient monarch were placed under an interdict. It is almost impossible for us to realise the horror that an interdict implied to the nation, or to the monarch placed under its awful ban. All churches were closed and means of grace suspended, except the baptism of infants and the absolution of the dying. There was no toleration of thought or doctrine in those days; no other places of worship existed, no meetings allowed in private houses for the study of God's Holy Word. As the theory became fact, the secular courts, magistrates and princes, had to carry out the will of the Pope at the risk of excommunication and all the temporal consequences

which it involved. Gregory VII. deposed Henry IV. of Germany; Gregory IX. excommunicated the Emperor Frederic II. In these instances the power of the Pope prevailed, but it was through bloodshed, misery, and wrong.

Roman authorities shall be witnesses to the disasters of this temporal sovereignty of the Popes, producing not only wars, but bringing a fearful moral corruption upon the Popes and Curia. St. Bonaventura, a cardinal, did not hesitate to declare Rome to be the harlot spoken of in Rev. xvii. and xviii.[1]

When Pope Innocent III. wished to make John of Parma a cardinal, he refused, saying, "The Roman Church hardly concerns itself with anything but wars and juggleries." St. Hildegard, a famous prophetess, honoured by bishops and emperors, predicted of the Popes as early as 1170, "They seize upon us like ravening beasts, with their power of binding and loosing, and through them the whole Church is withered. They desire to subject the kingdoms of the world, but the nations will rise against them and the too rich and haughty clergy. The pride of the Popes, who no longer observe any religion, will be brought low . . . partly in consequence of wars, partly by the common agreement of the States." Her predictions have been literally fulfilled. Rome has not erased these claims from her statute-books,

[1] See Janus, "Pope and Council," p. 277. Dante also applied this apocalyptic prophecy to the Popes.

but the Churches and the world have alike discarded them.[1]

Had the bishops of Rome studied the Scriptures, their theory of a true Church would have been very different. They would have learnt that Jesus Christ, the Head of the Church, had refused to accept the sovereign power of this world when offered to Him by Satan (Matt. iv. 8, 10, D.), and when pressed upon Him by the crowds whom He had miraculously fed (John vi. 15, D.). They would have remembered His words to the apostles, "*The kings of the Gentiles lord it over them . . . but you not so: but he who is the greatest among you let him be as the least, and he that is the leader, as he that serveth. . . . I am in the midst of you as he that serveth*" (Luke xxii. 25, 27, D.). Other solemn words of warning and foresight would have occurred to them: "*But be not you called Rabbi. For one is your Master, and all you are brethren*" (Matt. xxiii. 8, D.). In short, they would have learnt that worldly ambition had no place in the spiritual kingdom of Christ. Their magnificent theory bears a close resemblance to that dream of the Jewish Sanhedrim—of a national and ecclesiastical empire—

[1] The temporal sovereignty of Rome may be said to have been extinguished in 1870, when Victor Emmanuel became the King of Italy and made Rome the capital. It was brought to an end by the unrighteousness of its government, the indignation of its Roman subjects, and by the instrumentality of the Roman Catholic kingdoms of Italy and France. Protestants took no part in its overthrow; it was the work of Rome's own children.

which caused them to reject the true Messiah; or to the aims of the great world-conquerors—Alexander, Cæsar, and Napoleon—but it is far removed from our Lord's word, "*Lo, the kingdom of God is within you*" (Luke xvii. 21, D.), or as expounded by St. Paul, "*The kingdom of God is not meat and drink, but justice, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost*" (Rom. xiv. 17, D.).

[Rome and Mexico. For over a hundred years, ever since the separation of Mexico from Spain, the Roman Catholic Church has wielded enormous power in that country. Her vast wealth and influence has made her a political force of the first importance, and she has used her power as it seemed good to her. In 1857, by which time the Church is said to have controlled a third of the total wealth of the country, an anti-clerical law was passed, stripping the Church of most of her landed property, breaking up the monastic orders, and forbidding the Church to accumulate more wealth than was sufficient for the needs of her definitely religious work. Under the long reign of President Diaz the Church won back much of her former power. In 1917 new anti-clerical legislation was passed, and it is against the execution of these laws that the Mexican Church is now in revolt. To these laws the bishops have replied by suspending the public functions of the Church, and by encouraging their people in a sort of economic boycott of the State. What are Protestant observers to think of all this? The view of the Mexican Government is that the State cannot tolerate the existence of a Church which is in effect an alien Power working within the Republic for its own reactionary ends. The Pope's instruction to the Mexican Episcopate is, "I condemn this law and order you to disobey it," thus defying both the Government and the Constitution.]

IV

THE THEORY A FAILURE AS REGARDS THE PRESERVATION OF VISIBLE UNITY IN THE CHURCH

Q.—Allowing that Rome's claim to temporal sovereignty was a mistake, opposed to our Lord's words, "*My kingdom is not of this world*," may not her claim to spiritual supremacy be favourably regarded as being conducive to the Church's visible Unity, prayed for by our Lord?

A.—Doubtless at first sight it is a very beautiful idea that all Christians should be united in some visible organisation, and it is certainly much to be desired that all should live in charity one with another. But again, we must guard against the error of putting our own ideas of expediency into the place of FACTS. On the ground of expediency we might argue for the continuance of the miraculous gifts of the Holy Spirit, or for the personal infallibility of every Christian, or for the *immediate* answer to every petition of the Divine Master that He ever offered up on behalf of His disciples. But it is not so. And to suppose that this particular prayer for unity—John xvii. 21—has been fulfilled

in the Church of Rome, or as a promise pertains only to that Church, would deprive Christ of His exalted Headship over more than half of those who have been baptized into His holy name.

There are different kinds of unity. There is the unity of the Jewish Church and people, which is selfish and self-contained, refusing fellowship with others, and ever exciting the jealousy of the nations —a unity founded on the misunderstanding of promises made by God unto their fathers. There is the unity of the Donatists in the fourth century, who claimed to be "*the* Church," "*the* Catholic Church," and excommunicated all other Christians. Rome's idea of unity has much in common with these two instances. Like the Jews, she misinterprets the lively oracles of God; like the Donatist, she procures unity for *herself* (not for Christ's Church) by excommunicating other Christian Churches and refusing to hold fellowship with them. Her external unity is at the expense of freedom— the freedom of the individual soul, and, if it were possible, the freedom of the Holy Spirit, whose grace and influence she would fain limit to her own ordinances. Of this unity it has been truly said,[1] that there have been times in the history of the Roman Church when "it forced the gospel of the love of God into the terribly alien form of human tyranny, demanding not only obedience, but acquies-

[1] Creighton's "History of the Papacy," vol. v. 107.

cence and faith under the pain of horrible punishment"—witness the acts of the Spanish Inquisition. Such *violent repression* of the right and power of conscience cannot be enforced in the present day, but Rome's idea of unity is still that of an Oriental despotism, whose laws are carried out with painful and relentless uniformity, whose only idea of unity is that which arises from unquestioning obedience and subjection.

The claim of Rome to be the centre and preserver of unity in Christ's Church has failed as completely as her claim to temporal sovereignty. The Church's broken unity lies emphatically at her door. Rome is, and has been, the GREAT CAUSE OF SCHISM.

Instead of being the centre of unity and the healer of divisions, Rome has been the greatest cause of *disunion* in the kingdom of Christ upon earth. In the early ages the different Churches respected each other's nationality and independence. Their separate synods drew up the local forms of government and discipline. No bishop or diocese interfered with any other, except by way of mutual consultation and advice. When heresies arose, or questions of universal importance, the various Churches sent representatives to a General Council, as, *e.g.* to that of Nicæa, which was summoned to defend the deity of Christ against Arius—a Council not convened by the Pope of Rome, nor in any

degree directed by him. In this manner real visible unity and intercommunication were secured throughout the Universal Church for centuries. But this unity was troubled, and at last broken, by the growing ambition of the Bishops of Rome, whose position as bishops of the capital of the Roman Empire gave them opportunities of much personal influence. From this cause arose the first great division of the Church Catholic. The separation of the Eastern or Greek Church from the Western or Roman Church was mainly the result of the arrogance of the Roman pontiffs, though the Greeks were not faultless in the matter. That division has never been healed, and is now intensified by the new doctrine of Papal Infallibility.

The REFORMATION, again, was the result of the ambition of the Popes, combined with their covetousness, their nepotism, their abuse of patronage, in many instances their profligacy; above all, it was necessitated by their introducing false and superstitious doctrines, imposed upon the laity under anathema. Rome excommunicated and persecuted those who were longing for a spiritual reformation, instead of purifying her doctrines and discipline and seeking to maintain the "unity of the spirit in the bond of peace." That gap, too, has been widened by the new dogmas of the Immaculate Conception and the Pope's infallibility.

Such arbitrary innovations are ever producing

new schisms. The two doctrines just mentioned have already caused several secessions from the Roman Church—*e.g.* the formation of the "Old Catholic," the Spanish, the Italian, and the Polish Reformed Churches. Nay, her pride seems to delight in accentuating causes of disunion. Look at her recent demand as an essential to Ordination, that there should be definitely expressed the sacred order of the Priesthood, or its grace and power, which is affirmed to be chiefly the power of consecrating and offering the Body and Blood of the Lord; whereas no such power is mentioned in Holy Scripture, nor is expressed in the earliest ordination services of the Church. It is a demand unknown to the Universal Church for centuries; and therefore, if essential, must be fatal to the sacerdotal claims of her own Popes and ministers.

And as Rome is the cause of divisions in the Catholic Church, so her particular theory of unity is *hurtful to herself*. The unity she possesses arises from an enforced suppression of thought and liberty. A Roman Catholic must not enter a Protestant church,[1] nor read the Bible without permission, nor any literature which is prohibited by the Index Prohibitorius,[2] nor receive the Eucharist without a yearly enforced confession.[3] By these means an

[1] Except at weddings and funerals. "Threshold," &c., pp. 97, 98.

[2] *i.e.* Rome's list of prohibited books.

[3] Many Romanists confess weekly—frequent confession is advised.

external unity, or rather uniformity, is preserved, whilst real differences, questionings, and disputes are rife notwithstanding. Cardinal Manning wrote truly to Monsignor Talbot, "It is well that the Protestant world does not know how our work is hindered by domestic strife"[1]—the strife was amongst English Roman Catholics. Apart from *uniformity* the union in Rome is purely mythical.

[1] Purcell's "Life of Manning," vol. ii. pp. 80, 81.

[In October, 1926, Dr. Frere, the Bishop of Truro, went to Malines to take part in the resumed conversations with the representatives of Rome on the subject of re-union, a course of procedure sanctioned by the Archbishop of Canterbury in spite of the fact that Rome has declared that she is *semper eadem*. Bishop J. C. Ryle has well observed, "Let us have no peace with Rome till she abjures her errors and is at peace with Christ. Till Rome does that the vaunted re-union of Western Churches, which some talk of and press upon our notice, is an insult to Christianity."—*What do the Times require?*]

V

CHRIST'S PRAYER FOR UNITY

Q.—In what sense is Christ's prayer for Unity to be understood if it does not refer to the present visible organisation of His Church? (John xvii. 21, D.).

A.—The reverent reader of the entire chapter will at once observe that our Lord's words and prayers as to the "oneness" of His people are very profound. The more they are pondered over, the less will it appear possible that any external unity, any earthly system, any one visible society, can satisfy the deep-spirit words of this High-Priestly prayer of our adorable Redeemer, uttered on the night of His agony, and under the conscious nearness of His Cross and Passion. The prayer is "*not for the world*" (v. 9), but "*for those who believe on Him*" (v. 20); that they may have union, or oneness, *with God* and with *Himself*, Jesus Christ; "*that they all may be one, as Thou, Father, in Me, and I in Thee, that they also may be one in Us*" (v. 21); "*that they may be one as We also are one; I in them, and Thou in Me, that they may be made perfect in* (*or into*)

one" (v. 23); *"that the love wherewith Thou hast loved Me may be in them, and I in them"* (v. 26). Weighing these words in and by themselves, the oneness is too pure, too holy, too sublime and mystical to belong to anything material and organic. It is *unity in diversity*, as the functions of the Holy Trinity are Diverse and yet one—"one in Us," not in the Papacy, or necessarily in any visible society, but "one in Us," in the Blessed Trinity. It is unity in certain qualities and spiritual virtues—in faith (v. 8), in holiness (v. 10), in separation from the world (v. 14), in truth (v. 19), in love (v. 26)—qualities which can only proceed from Christ Himself by the operation of the Holy Ghost (John xvi. 14, D.), and can only be experienced in a *"life hidden with Christ in God"* (Col. iii. 3, D.). No Church can say that this is the spiritual state of all its members as a *visible, organic society.* The "oneness" is not that of the Greek, or Roman, or Anglican, or Lutheran, or Presbyterian, or Wesleyan, or of any one visible Church communion. Yet it is true of *certain members in them* ALL, that they are thus united by a *living conscious faith to Christ Himself*, as branches in the Vine, and that they bring forth much fruit to the glory of God the Father. In such the love of Christ is a constraining power for holiness, and a power that unites them to all that love the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity (Ephes. vi. 24, D.). Having "fellowship with God and with His Son Jesus

Christ," they have "*fellowship one with another*" (1 John i. 3 and 7, R.V.). The anathemas of Churches are of no avail against this *felt "oneness" with each other in Christ*, or, as the prayer more mystically expresses it, "in Us."

The reason why so many have thought that visible unity must be intended in this prayer of our Lord has probably arisen from the desire expressed "*that the world may believe that Thou didst send Me.*" But the hindrance to the world's belief in Christ has not been the mere absence of visible organic unity. The Roman Church once possessed this undisputed unity in Spain and Italy and Austria, and South America and the Philippine Islands, but the spectacle of those nations has not convinced the world. The hindrances to the world's believing upon Christ are of a different order. The bitterness, the aggressiveness, the strife, the excommunications, the intolerance, the ignorance, the refusal to hold communion with those who differ—these things have SHOCKED the world. When to this un-Christlike spirit are added those unscriptural demands on faith which Rome has multiplied, and to which there appears no limit and no restraint, we cannot wonder that a *misrepresented* Christianity has so greatly failed to convert the world.

Let no one make light of unity and intercommunion among the several branches of the Universal Church. The slightest wish of the Lord Jesus

should affect every disciple. Only let it be remembered that any lasting union depends upon its being grounded in truth and manifested in love. Christ said, "*By this shall all men know that you are My disciples, if you have* LOVE *for one another*" (John xiii. 35, D.). He never said that His people should constitute one fold: He spoke of them as "one flock" (John x. 16, R.V.)—the folds may be many, the flock will be one. The very solemnity, and almost sadness, which pervades the prayer seems to intimate that our Lord did not anticipate its complete fulfilment in the present dispensation. The prayer resembles His command, "*Be you perfect, as also your Heavenly Father is perfect*," in that it suggests a lofty object to be aimed at, though, through man's self-will, not to be attained or manifested until that day "when the great Shepherd of the sheep shall *present it to Himself a glorious Church, not having spot or wrinkle, or any such thing*" (Eph. v. 27, D.).

The prayer, rightly regarded, should lessen bigotry, induce the cultivation of charity and humility, and check every attempt to introduce terms of communion and salvation not insisted upon by Christ, the Head of the Church—virtues and courses of action which Rome too frequently ignores or contradicts.

[1] See Bishop Westcott *in loco.*

VI

THE THEORY A FAILURE AS REGARDS THE TEACHING OF TRUTH.

Q.—Although the Church of Rome has failed in preserving unity, is she not justified in claiming the promise of Jesus Christ that He would give his Holy Spirit to "*guide*" His Church "*into all the truth*"? (John xvi. 13, R.V.).

A.—It is difficult to discuss Rome's claim to be the sole guide into all truth when she has failed so lamentably in her use of temporal sovereignty and in the preservation of unity. However, as the question introduces important passages to which Rome has given an unnatural interpretation, it may be well to consider the promise of the Holy Spirit as made by Christ.

The promise of the Holy Spirit is contained not in one text only, but in several. It is important, therefore, to consider their immediate application to the apostles, and their lasting reference to the Universal Church and to its individual members, for ALL Christians have their part in this the greatest of all the promises and gifts of the ascended Lord.

Take first the promise (John xvi. 13) in its immediate application to the apostles. Our blessed Lord had just said (v. 12), "*I have yet many things to say to you, but ye cannot bear them now.*" No one can question the sorrowfulness of these words. The Master's disciples could not enter into the most solemn part of His mission as the Saviour of the world. They would not listen to the mention of the Cross and Passion as necessary to man's salvation.[1] They were unfit to proclaim the gospel of reconciliation. The nature and purpose of the Church they could not comprehend. The full motive and intention of the Incarnation they could "not bear," *i.e.*, they could not then receive. These were to be unfolded to them by the Holy Spirit after the Ascension. They were to learn from the "Spirit of Truth," and by Him to be inspired to write the Epistles, which should reveal and explain those truths they were then, from prejudice and ignorance, and even from sorrow, unable to receive, much less to impart to others. The promised Comforter would come to them after their Lord's departure, and "*When He, the Spirit of Truth, is come, He shall guide you into all the truth.*" Such was the promise to the apostles, and the inspired New Testament is the permanent result and the fulfilment.[2]

[1] Matt. xvi. 22, "Peter began to rebuke Him, saying, Lord, this shall not be unto Thee" (D.).

[2] Bishop Westcott *in loco.*

Again, the promises of the Holy Spirit were doubtless in great measure made to the twelve as *representatives* of the whole Church of Christ. The Saviour had promised that the gates of hell should not prevail against His Church, and that He would be with it unto the end of the ages (Matt. xxviii. 20) —the protection and the presence being both supplied by His Vicegerent, the Holy Ghost. Here again the caution is needed not to confound the Church of Rome with the Catholic and Universal Church to which the promises were made. These promises are not made to St. Peter, but to all the apostles; not to any particular Church, but to the WHOLE. Rome sometimes boasts that she is the only Church which claims the Spirit's guidance. This is untrue: she may in her arrogance be the only Church which *denies* it to others; but the Protestant Churches even more fully honour the Holy Spirit, and rely upon His guidance for wisdom in the interpretation of His Word, and for sanctification of life and character. The difference between the Protestant Churches and the Roman is that the latter presumes to claim the *exclusive* guidance of the Holy Spirit, and to assert that every novelty in her creed is the result of that guidance. The claim is refuted by the FACTS of the Church's history, for Rome's peculiar doctrines contradict the teaching of the Holy Spirit as contained in the Word of God.[1]

[1] For full proof of this statement read Part II. of this book.

Rome has erred by denying the cup to the laity, by her doctrines of Transubstantiation, Indulgences, Mariolatry, and the like. But however *separate* Churches may fail, the words of Christ constitute a promise that truth shall never be lost as regards the *Church Universal*. Our Lord's warnings as to false apostles and wolves in sheep's clothing, and His letters to the Seven Churches in Asia, set forth the probability that portions of His Church may be seduced into error. But His promise cheers us with the assurance that the truth obscured in one portion will be preserved in another, and that those which have lost it may ultimately be recovered. The Arian heresy, which denied the Divinity of our Lord, so overspread the Church of the fourth century that the Arians were at one time positively in the majority. Liberius, the Pope of Rome, himself subscribed to their heresy. It seemed as if Christ's promise had failed. But the Holy Spirit raised up Athanasius, endowing him with truth and marvellous courage. He was a bishop of the African, not of the Roman Church. History describes him as "against the world"—so solitary was he and so bold—and through his protests and endurance the truth again prevailed in the Churches which had lapsed.

This instance of individual illumination and grace is confirmed by the experience of countless souls outside the Roman communion. Multitudes of Pro-

testants can tell of the guidance which cometh from above. The Holy Spirit, the Spirit of Truth, has taken of the things of Jesus and revealed them to their understanding and perception. They have found the Son of God to be "*The Way, the Truth, and the Life*," and have thus found "*rest unto their souls*." No hard and heartless theory can deprive these of this joy and of their reward. No "exclusive claims" will ever shake their confidence in the felt guidance and the love of the Spirit. The Roman theory looks ghastly and self-condemned in the light of the present power of the Holy Ghost manifested in the growing Churches which the Papacy dares to exclude from the pale of salvation.

With thankfulness be it acknowledged that there are tokens of new spiritual life among many members of the Roman Church at the present time. There is a spirit of inquiry leading souls to the personal study of God's Word. There are priests as well as lay persons who are awakening to the dangers of Mariolatry and of new cults—such as that of St. Joseph and of the Sacred Heart. The revival wrought by the Holy Spirit in the Church of England, acknowledged by Cardinal Manning, may, through the Divine compassion, extend to Rome, and produce a reformation and return to the truth as taught by our Lord and the Apostles. The errors of the Roman Church prove that she has been disobedient to the spirit of truth which

inspired the Apostles; but God does not leave Himself without witness, and faithful souls in all Churches are partakers of the Holy Spirit's promised aid. Surely, yea doubtless, many Romanists are better than their creed!

VII

THE COMPLETION OF THE THEORY—THE INFALLIBILITY OF THE POPE

Q.—What is meant by the Infallibility of the Pope? When was it made a dogma of the Roman Church? Why has it been rejected by all other Churches?

A.—The dogma of the Pope's infallibility is the last of Rome's unprimitive and uncatholic doctrines. It was decreed at the Vatican Council held in Rome so late as 1870. The decree was issued in Latin, and the authorised English translation [1] is as follows: "We teach and define that it is a dogma divinely revealed, that the Roman Pontiff, when he speaks *ex cathedrâ*—that is, when, in the discharge of his office of pastor and teacher of all Christians, by virtue of his supreme apostolic authority, he defines a doctrine regarding faith or morals, to be held by the Universal Church—is, by the Divine assistance promised to him in Blessed Peter, possessed of that infallibility with which the Divine Redeemer willed that the Church should be endowed in defining

[1] Bagshawe, "Threshold of the Catholic Church," p. 260.

doctrine regarding faith or morals; and that, therefore, such definitions of the Roman Pontiffs are of themselves, and not from the consent of the Church, irreformable."

The decree has been rejected by all non-Roman Churches. It has also been a source of regret and distress to many Romanists. Before its promulgation Cardinal Newman wrote to the Roman Catholic Bishop Ullathorne, "Why should an aggressive insolent faction be allowed to make the heart of the just sad whom the Lord hath not made sorrowful? Why cannot we be let alone when we have pursued peace and thought no evil? I assure you, my lord, some of the truest minds are driven one way and another, and do not know where to rest their feet—one day determining to give up theology as a bad job, and recklessly to believe henceforth that the Pope is impeccable; at another, tempted to believe all the worst which a book like 'Janus' says. Then, again, think of the store of pontifical scandals in the history of eighteen centuries which have partly been poured forth and partly are still to come."

Some of the ablest Roman theologians opposed it,[1] but the dogma had been determined upon by the Curia and the Pope, "*and not from the consent of the Church*," as the decree only too truly expresses it, for it was carried against the protests and reasonings

[1] Dr. Döllinger, Bishop Dupanloup of Orleans, Archbishop Darboy of Paris, Bishop Hefele, and many others.

of the most learned. The great mass of Romanists have treated it with indifference, whilst numbers of those who bowed to the decision did so on the ground that the decree would prove to be impotent. Not a few console themselves with the excuse made by Newman to his friend W. Probyn-Nevins, Oxford, "the formal conditions of the occasions when his (the Pope's) teaching is infallible are not determined," which is equivalent to saying that no one can ever be sure when the Pope does speak infallibly.

The number of unproved and unprovable assertions in the decree should be noticed—that the dogma "has been divinely revealed," which it has not; that the Roman Pontiff is "pastor and teacher of all Christians," which is repudiated by more than half Christendom; that he has apostolic authority over "the universal Church," which is an arrogant assumption, the Pope being only the chief bishop of the Roman communion; that the Popes can define all doctrines "of themselves, and not from the consent of the Church," which is opposed to the teaching of Rome for centuries; and that such definitions of doctrines once made are "irreformable," *i.e.*, final and irreversible, a dangerous assertion, which deprives Rome of the power of rectifying her mistakes.

The boastful and presumptuous language in which the dogma is clothed is trifling compared to the falsehood of the dogma itself. The reasons against the dogma are overwhelming.

NOVELTY OF THE DOCTRINE.—The fact that the infallibility of the Pope was not held as a dogma even by the Roman Church for 1800 years is alone sufficient to condemn it. It was rejected by the Councils of Constance and Basle. It is not mentioned in the decrees of the Council of Trent, nor in the Creed of Pope Pius IV., which added so many doctrines to the Roman Church. A general assembly of the bishops and clergy of France was held in 1682, at which the celebrated Bossuet, Bishop of Meaux (1681–1704), drew up a declaration on the limits of the authority of the Pope. In this declaration it was affirmed that the "Pope's judgment is not irreversible or irreformable until confirmed by the consent of the Church." Bossuet further declared "the whole question of infallibility is put amongst matters that are speculative and vain."[1] These are sufficient to show the views of the French Romanists in the seventeenth century. The same is expressed in the "Protestation of English Romanists" in 1788, when seeking relief from some oppressive Acts of Parliament from Mr. Pitt. The signatories to the Protestation state plainly, "We acknowledge no infallibility in the Pope." The Irish bishops made a similar declaration when seeking for toleration in the middle of last century, declaring that "the doctrine of the Pope's personal infallibility was no part of the Christian faith."[2] Keenan's Catechism

[1] Salmon, p. 264. [2] Protestation, S.P.C.K., p. 31.

published with the approval of Irish and Scotch Roman bishops, had this question, "Must not Catholics believe the Pope in himself to be infallible?" To which the answer given was, "That is a Protestant invention: it is no article of the Catholic faith," &c. The Catechism is still circulated, but since 1870 the question and answer are judiciously left out! Many other proofs could be given, but these suffice to show that this recent momentous article of faith is condemned by its very NOVELTY.

INFALLIBILITY REFUTED BY THE HERESIES AND MISTAKES OF POPES.—At the time of the Arian heresy, that heresy which denied the divinity of our Lord, Liberius was Pope, or Bishop of Rome. At first he courageously opposed the heresy, but on another bishop being appointed to take his see, he wrote official letters to the Arian bishops of the East (intended for publication by them), in which he gave to Arianism all the weight of his official position, thus making himself guilty of their grievous error. Evidently he sacrificed his orthodoxy to his ambition, and forfeited all claim to infallibility. Pope Vigilius lies under similar suspicion, but the case of Pope Honorius is unquestionable. This Pope was condemned as a Monothelite heretic by the Sixth General Council of Constantinople amid cries of "Anathema to the heretic Honorius." Evidently the dogma of the Pope's infallibility was not then received. The anathema against Honorius was

repeated by successive Popes for hundreds of years, and stood in the Roman Breviary until the latter part of the sixteenth century.

MISTAKES OF POPES ALSO DISPROVE IT.—These are too numerous to dwell upon. Nicolas I. assured the Bulgarians that baptism only in the name of Christ was valid. Nicolas II. compelled Berengarius to acknowledge the Capernaite heresy that Christ's body is *sensibly* (*sensualiter*) touched by the hands and broken by the teeth in the Eucharist. Pope Gelasius insisted upon communion in *both* kinds; recent Popes forbid the wine to the laity. Eugenius in his instruction to the Armenians, which is added to the Acts of the Council of Florence (A.D. 1439), insists upon the delivery of the sacramental vessels to the candidates for holy orders as essential to their ordination. But such a condition had not been required before. The decree of the infallibility (A.D. 1870) requires that the Pope should speak to the Universal Church when he utters a decree that is to be infallible. But such a condition was unknown for a thousand years, so that Rome condemns all previous utterances of Popes as fallible, or at least those before the Bull of "Unam Sanctam" of Pope Boniface VIII. in 1303, which is the first addressed to the whole Church. The complications and contradictions are endless![1]

PAPAL SCHISMS.—If Christ appointed a visible

[1] See for contradictions, pp. 18, 19 on Primacy.

representative to govern and teach His Church, it is self-evident that in order to receive these benefits the Church must always know for a CERTAINTY who is this favoured and responsible person. There cannot be two genuine heads at the same time. Yet from the fourth century to the Reformation there were constant schisms and rival Popes, each claiming to be the vicar of Christ and denouncing his rival as an impostor. The most prolonged of these contentions, said to be the twenty-ninth, is known as "The Great Western Schism." It began in 1378 and lasted forty years, during which time two or more Popes disputed the honour of being the rightful successor of St. Peter. The first Pope elected was Urban VI., an Italian, set up through the violence of the Roman citizens. He was opposed, and stigmatised as deserving the title of apostate and Antichrist, and a French Pope was set up in opposition, Clement VII. Each anathematised the ordinations and the religious acts of the other, different countries supporting different Popes and their rival claims. Both could not be vicars of Christ; both could not be infallible. Nor was it ever decided which had justice on his side. This leads to another argument against the Papal infallibility.

THE IMMORAL LIVES OF SEVERAL POPES.—No Christian can find pleasure in unveiling the inconsistencies of those from whom he differs; but when divine attributes are assumed and claimed for

a human being as a dogma necessary to salvation the challenge is thrown down as to the character of those for whom this dignity is demanded. Divine character should accompany the divine claim. An occasional failing on the part of an individual Pope might be passed over, but how can infallibility be claimed for a succession of bad men! Let the Roman Catholic historian Baronius record the history and character of Popes in the tenth century:—

"A new age[1] begins, which, from its asperity and barrenness of good, has been wont to be called the Iron Age; from the deformity of its overflowing wickedness, the Leaden Age; and from its paucity of writers, the Dark Age. . . . The case is plainly such, that scarcely any one can believe, yea, ever shall believe, unless he see it with his own eyes and handle it with his own hands, what unworthy, foul, and deformed, yea, what execrable and abominable things the sacred Apostolic See, upon whose hinge the Universal Catholic Church turns, has been compelled to suffer. O shame! O grief! how many monsters, horrible to be seen, were intruded by secular princes into that seat which is to be reverenced by angels! how many tragedies were consummated! with what filth was it her fate to be spattered, who was herself without spot or wrinkle! with what loathsome impurities to be defiled, and by those to be blackened with perpetual infamy!"

[1] "Infallibility of the Church," by Salmon, p. 102.

So again (A.D. 912), "What was then the face of the Holy Roman Church? How most foul when harlots, at once most powerful and most base, ruled at Rome, at whose will Sees were changed, bishops were presented, and, what is horrible to hear and unutterable, pseudo-bishops, their paramours, were intruded into the See of St. Peter, who are enrolled in the catalogue of Roman pontiffs only for the sake of marking the times."

Instances of the same nature might be added in the lives of Alexander VI. and Julius II., and others,[1] but this awful record by a Romanist more than sufficiently refutes the Papal claims for exclusive spiritual guidance and infallibility.

INFALLIBILITY CONDEMNED BY ITS USELESSNESS. —How can the claim be credited unless it approves itself by settling great questions and deciding controversies QUICKLY? But this is just what Roman infallibility never does. It was not a Pope who determined the canon of the New Testament, nor summoned the Council of Nicæa to resist the Arian heresy and proclaim the truth of our Lord's Divinity. The distinctive doctrines of Rome were severally disputed for centuries before a Pope ventured to speak. During these long silences as to purgatory, indulgences, and transubstantiation,

[1] Both Dante and Petrarch (1374) apply the language of the Apocalypse to the Popes of their day (Apoc. xvii. 3 and xviii. 3).

multitudes of priests must have been teaching false or defective doctrine without guidance or correction. An assumed power which never speaks when matters are in dispute, which never guides her children whilst points are doubtful, which only ratifies the *results* of protracted debate and public opinion, is valueless. Eighteen hundred years pass before infallibilism can decide where infallibility is seated! Romanists have lived and died in error and anxiety as to what is truth, because the infallible Popes did not know what to say! The dogma is disproved by its Uselessness.

Well might Archbishop Tillotson write concerning it: "This point of the Pope's supremacy, upon which Bellarmine has the confidence to say 'the whole of Christianity depends,' is not only an indefensible, but an impudent cause as ever was undertaken by learned pens. There is not one tolerable argument for it, and there are a thousand invincible reasons against it. There is neither from Scripture nor reason nor antiquity any evidence of it. The past and the present state of Christendom, the histories and records of all ages, are a perpetual demonstration against it. There is no other ground for it in the whole world but that for a long time it has been boldly asserted, and without reason stiffly contended for by the Pope's Janizaries."[1]

[1] Preface to the Treatise of the Pope's Supremacy.

NOTE.—The doctrine of the Church's infallibility had been held by Romanists for centuries, but it was an open question as to where it resided. In the judgment of their most eminent doctors it depended upon the concord of the Pope and a Council representing the whole Church. All questionings have been closed by the decree of a Roman Council held at the Pope's palace—the Vatican—in 1870, that infallibility resides in the Pope alone without a Council. At the close of the Council, 764 bishops were present, and of these 535 voted "placet" (assented), and 229 bishops either absented themselves or did not vote. Of those who assented, no fewer than 120 were "titular bishops," having neither See nor jurisdiction. This enormous number were Italians, created bishops by the Pope to secure the passing of the dogma. Like the Council of Trent, this Vatican Council was purely Roman and not Catholic; nor was it a "free" Council, as the Italian bishops were entirely under the influence of the Pope. How different from the Council at Jerusalem, where St. James presided, and the subject for decision was freely discussed by *laity, presbyters* and apostles (Acts xv. 4, 22).

[The Council of 1870 decided that Infallibility resided in the person of the Pope. But that decision *ipso facto* ruled out infallibility from the Council. Where, then, is the guarantee that the decision which it took was right?

Put shortly, the infallibility of the Pope depends upon the decree of a fallible Council.]

VIII

INFALLIBILITY "A PRIORI"

Q.—So far the reply has been taken from facts which appear irresistible. But Romanists dwell much upon a *necessity* that Christ should appoint an infallible head to preserve the Church from errors and schisms, and to give a correct interpretation of the Bible. Is there not force in this line of reasoning?

A.—There is really no weight to be attached to such considerations, however plausible. Looking upon the state of Christendom from the separation between the East and West to the present time, it is evident that either the supposed intention of Christ has failed, or that the supposed necessity for an infallible guide is a great mistake. Reverence and truth compel us to adopt the latter alternative, which is alone consistent with facts and history. The plea of necessity or expediency is the one chiefly relied upon in modern Roman books, but it is the old *à priori* argument, and decides nothing. It is useless to argue that a doctrine must be true because we think it wise or advisable,

that it must be God's plan because we presume to imagine that it ought to be. It is as foolish as to argue that because all men sooner or later have bodily illnesses, and the doctors differ so widely and fail so frequently, therefore there *must* be an infallible doctor somewhere to instruct all other doctors, and to effect the certainty of cure in all cases. The reasoner might say: "Is not such an infallible centre greatly needed? Is it not desirable, is it not expedient, yea, is it not necessary? Yea, considering God's compassion, *ought* it not to be? and if some one *claimed* to be this infallible physician, ought we not to believe him *to be what he professes*, even though we see the sick and dying around us?" This is an exact illustration of Rome's claim in religion, and the absurdity of the one shows the absurdity of the other, for there is no foundation in *fact* or in *results* for either the one or the other.

If the mind must speculate and form its *à priori* judgments, would it not be much more reasonable to ask, Why, if the dogma is true, was it not *distinctly and unmistakably* taught by Christ Himself or at least by His apostles? Why was it never referred to in the doctrinal difficulties of the Roman and Galatian believers, and in the irregularities of the Corinthian Church? How came it that each apostle, and in after times each bishop in his own See, settled the disputes without reference to St. Peter? Nay,

can we not trace in the record of the manifold failings and mistakes of St. Peter a Divine *prescience* of this error, and a Divine *premonition* that the Church might be guarded and the Popes warned against such rash ambition? If the Roman Church has existed in spite of its uncertainty as to the Pope's infallibility these eighteen hundred years, what special necessity can there be for it now? What new circumstances have arisen? What divinely attested revelation has been given? Mere "sentiment" can have no weight in such a matter. True, Cardinal Vaughan piteously writes,[1] "In what a condition of inextricable chaos Christ left His Church" if the decision of Pope Pius IX. in 1870 is not accepted! But Christ did not leave His Church in a state of "chaos." There was no "chaos" amongst the Apostles—only perfect unity, because they remembered their Master's words, "*All you are brethren*" (Matt. xxiii. 8, D.). There was no "chaos" among the bishops who succeeded them for several centuries, because no bishop interfered with his neighbour; their provincial synods and national churches were independent; great and solemn questions, which concerned "*the faith once for all delivered to the saints*,"[2] were settled in General Councils attended by representatives summoned from all the branches of the Catholic Church, not by the Bishop

[1] Vindication of the Bull "Apostolicæ Curæ."
[2] Jude 3.

of Rome, but by sovereigns. Chaos was begun by Rome when she forgot St. Peter's exhortation, and tried to "*lord it over God's heritage*,"[1] careless of the Divine warning. Then arose jealousies and heartburnings, separations and secessions, which are now stereotyped by Rome's declaration that the doctrines are infallible and "irreformable." Her dogma of infallibility perpetuates whatever *chaos* Rome has caused—it is another stumbling-block in the way of unity and of the world's believing upon Christ.

There remains the favourite argument of Romanists that the Bible is capable of so many interpretations that it is useless, yea, mischievous, without an infallible interpreter; that it is "inadequate as a rule of faith because so many differences of opinion exist among those who profess to follow its teaching;" that "if there is no authorised interpreter it can be no guide." Now, if the Church of Rome feels at all seriously upon this subject, why does she not set forth without delay an infallible commentary on the Bible? Not only her own members, but the Churches throughout the world would read it with avidity—yes, even though she violated her own rule that no Scripture should be interpreted contrary to "the unanimous consent of the Fathers." It would enable her to correct some of her interpretations which are now exploded—that of Pope Boniface VIII. as to the

[1] 1 Peter v. 3, "neither as domineering over the clergy," Douay version.

two swords of the disciples (Luke xxii. 38, D.), that they represented the spiritual and temporal power of the Papacy; or of Innocent III. as to the sun and moon (Gen. i. 14), that the sun represents the sublime supremacy of the Popes, from which the kingdoms of earth, represented by the moon, have a *derived* and *reflected* existence; or of Mary as "full of grace" (Luke i. 28, D.), an expression which the Scriptures apply *exclusively* to the Incarnate Son of God; and specially to substitute "repentance" for the erroneous translation "penance," and to correct other misleading readings and interpretations too numerous to mention.

The accusation, that errors and schisms are the result of the study of the Bible, is irreverent and untrue; irreverent, as implying that God was not competent to indite His messages in language as easily to be understood as the language of a nineteenth-century Pope; untrue, for the grave errors of Romanism arise from the *neglect* of the Bible, and have their origin in the traditions of men. The differences of genuine Protestants are almost all on matters not essential to salvation, relating chiefly to church organisation, and they present no barrier to inter-communion.[1] But the erroneous doctrines of

[1] Bishop Cosin advised English Churchmen to communicate at the Reformed Churches on the Continent, stating "there is no prohibition of our Church against it, as there is against our communicating with the Papists."—"*Cosin on the Church*," *edited by W. Goode*, p. 236.

Rome are antagonistic to Scripture and inimical to faith. All that can be said of infallibility is that it is *a human device to give completeness to a human theory* —the top-stone being as unsound as the foundation.

It is a solemn matter this new dogma of infallibility vested in one sinful man! Can any one foresee the consequences? It casts a deep shadow upon many minds. Already it has proved another blow to reason and conscience and personal responsibility. Why read or investigate when infallibility has determined? It is idle to argue about what has been infallibly settled, and to question it on the part of a Romanist would be sin. Will the dignity of man made in the image of God stand this treatment? Will it bear this newly invented strain? Will it not revolt, and in that impending revolt may it not cast away the Divine truth with the human error? Leo XIII. tolerates any novelty in devotion and cult; he neither forbids nor endorses them *ex cathedra*. Devout Romanists see that the outward phase of their Christianity is changing rapidly; its predominant features are different from what they were fifty years ago. They desire the Living Voice to speak infallibly on these new cults, but it is dumb!

What if another Pope should use his gift, his power, and endorse these modern devotions? What will Latin Christianity become under a strong Pope such as Hildebrand? It is awful to contemplate

the future of Roman Catholicism with this new and occult power to attempt the silencing of reason, conscience, history, and even the Word of God.

Never was it more needful to "*stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ has made us free*," and to uphold the Bible as the rule of our faith—the infallible Word of our infallible God.

IX

ROME'S CLAIM TO EXCLUSIVE CATHOLICITY

Q.—As a further inference from the theory of Rome, do not Romanists claim an exclusive right to the title "Catholic," and is the claim to be allowed by Protestants?

A.—The Roman Church undoubtedly makes claim to the exclusive use of the title "Catholic." Thus in the reply of Cardinal Patrizzi to the "Association for Promoting the Unity of Christendom," written with the authority of the Holy Office, and dated Rome, 8th November 1865, the following statement occurs: "That the Catholic and Roman Church alone has received the name of Catholic; that no one can give to any other body the name of Catholic without incurring manifest heresy." Again, "that whosoever is separated from the one and only Catholic Church (*i.e.* the Church of Rome), howsoever well he may believe himself to live, by this one sin of separation is in a state of wrath"; "that every several soul is bound to enter the only Church of Christ (*i.e.* the Roman), out of which is neither salvation[1] nor entrance into the kingdom of heaven."

[1] On modification of this doctrine for England, see chap. xlvii.

It is not wonderful that such and many similar statements should call forth the indignation of Protestants, even as they awaken feelings of shame and sadness in the hearts of many Romanists. For the word "Catholic" means "universal," and was first employed to mark the contrast between the Jewish and Christian dispensations. The new Gospel dispensation is for the "whole world" (as the Greek implies), because there is no limit or restriction to its saving and reconciling work. The announcement of the angel was, "*I bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be to* ALL *people*" (Luke ii. 10). If Rome's claims were to be admitted, the great purpose of the Gospel would be defeated.

The claim of Rome to the exclusive use of the title "Catholic" was not made until many centuries after Christ. It was immediately repudiated by the "Apostolic Catholic and Orthodox Church" of the Greeks, as it is officially called, and by all Protestants at the Reformation. The article in the Nicene Creed—"I believe in one Catholic and Apostolic Church"—is a protest, historical and doctrinal, against it, for it was drawn up in the fourth century, when the Churches were still national and independent, and had no more special reference to the Roman Church than to the Church of Jerusalem, or Antioch, or Alexandria, or Constantinople.

The claim of the Roman Church to be the whole Church of Christ is as irrational as it would be for a

bay or gulf to claim to be the entire ocean, or for a branch to claim to be the whole tree, or for a limb to claim to be the whole body. "*Christ is the Head of the body, the Church,*" says St. Paul (Col. i. 18), and His own words were, "*I am the Vine, ye are the branches*" (John xv. 5). As St. Augustine expresses it—"Since the whole Christ is made up of the Head and the body—the Head is our Saviour Himself, who sits at the right hand of God; but His body is the Church; not this Church or that, but the Church scattered over all the world."[1]

This Church is "ONE" in relation to the one Governor—Christ—the "Bishop of our souls" (1 Peter ii. 25), and as participating in the one Holy Spirit of life. For the great Church of Christ is known not by its uniformity of organisation, or sameness of ceremonial rites, but as it is knit together by broader and more solemn principles, according to the Apostle's teaching, "*There is one body, and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling: one Lord,* ONE FAITH, *one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all*" (Eph. iv. 4–7)—where it should be observed that the "one faith" is the objective faith which the Apostles taught—that which "was once for all delivered to the saints" (Jude 3), and not the mediæval and recent faith, or body of doctrines, now required to be believed by Rome.

[1] St. Augustine on the Psalms, Ps. lvi. 1.

This ONE Church of the Nicene Creed is truly CATHOLIC by way of comprehension, being the aggregate of all particular Churches and receiving the members of all Churches into it. "Catholic," also, as it seeks to exalt the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ, and to bring the whole world to believe in Him. It is APOSTOLIC in proportion as it "perseveres in the doctrine of the apostles, and in the communication of the breaking of bread, and in prayers" (Acts ii. 42, D.). It is also HOLY by the very nature of the Divine vocation and the purpose for which it has been separated from the world. The Roman Church, by believing *only in itself*, and not in the aggregate of all the Churches, is un-Catholic, and virtually denies the Article in the Creeds.

Two matters of importance follow from the right use of the word "Catholic"—(1) That Romanists should never be called simply "Catholics," as this title is the common property of all Christians, to whatever visible Church they belong; members of the Church of Rome are "Romanists" or "*Roman*" Catholics; (2) that in reading Roman literature, care should be taken to see whether the quotations from Scripture and the Fathers do really refer to the *Roman* Church exclusively, or to the *Catholic* Church at large. It will be found that this confusion is usual in their writings, and its purpose is evident.

There is really only one reference to the Church of Rome in Holy Scripture—that solemn word of

warning, "*If God spared not the natural branches, take heed lest He also spare not thee*" (Rom. xi. 17–24). In all other passages the word "Church" in the New Testament either refers to a *local* Church, or to the Universal Church of all who believe in Christ Jesus.

The claim of Rome, therefore, to the exclusive use of the title "Catholic" is as unfounded as it is arrogant and misleading. It is neither scriptural nor primitive. The title belongs to Protestants as much as to Romanists—indeed, regarded as a witness to the intention of the incarnation and the atonement, it is much more in accordance with the *inclusive* spirit of Protestantism than with the *exclusive* spirit of Romanism. Let all study the mind of Christ in His answer to the complaint of St. John: "*Master, we saw one casting out devils in Thy name; and we forbade him, because he followed not us. But Jesus said,* FORBID HIM NOT: *for there is no man which shall do a mighty work in My name, and be able quickly to speak evil of Me. For he that is not against us is for us*" (Mark ix. 38–40, R.V.). What mighty works of conversion, justification, and holiness are constantly wrought by the Holy Spirit through the instrumentality and ministry of Protestants!

The saying of St. Augustine has a frequent application: "Those who are unjustly excommunicated are crowned of God in secret."

X

THE RISE AND GROWTH OF THE PAPACY

Q.—If the claims of Rome to supremacy over the visible Church have no support from Scripture, how can her Growth and Power be accounted for?

A.—The question is a very natural one, for Rome's supremacy over a great portion of the visible Church lasted from the separation of the Greek Church in the ninth century up to the Reformation; and her temporal authority from Pope Nicolas I. to Boniface VIII. It is right to acknowledge a Providence in all the great religious movements of the world. Some it is most difficult to explain, such as the spread of the religion of the false prophet Mohammed, and its continued growth, mustering 200,000,000 of followers at the present time; or that of the Buddhists and Brahmins with 670,000,000 of adherents. Compared with these, the rise and growth of the Roman Church is distinctly traceable to known and sufficient causes. Its history may be divided into four epochs.

The First Epoch was the purest, extending over the first four centuries of the Christian era. The

Roman Church had the great distinction of being the scene of the latest labours of the two eminent apostles, St. Paul and St. Peter. We know from the New Testament that St. Paul was a prisoner at Rome for years, and was permitted to preach Christ to all who came to him, whereby many were converted to the faith. St. Peter's residence at Rome is never alluded to in Scripture,[1] nor is there sufficient historical evidence for the claim that he was ever Bishop of Rome. He may have occasionally visited the city, and there is reason to believe that he died there as a martyr about the same time, some think on the same day, as the Apostle Paul. The Church thus organised by apostles continued purer in doctrine during these early centuries than other Churches, being less disturbed by heresies and philosophies "falsely so-called," than the Eastern and African Churches. As national and provincial Churches multiplied, it became the custom to reckon the importance of Churches and of bishops by the comparative greatness of the city in which they were established. Jerusalem was the mother of all Churches, yet she was ranked below Cæsarea, because under the Roman Imperial Government Cæsarea was the civil capital of the Holy Land. For the same reason Antioch preceded Cæsarea, and Alexandria preceded Antioch, and Rome took precedence of all as the Church and bishopric of the Imperial city—the capital of the civilised world. For the same reason, when the

[1] See Note at end of this chapter.

Emperors went to reside at Constantinople, that See was raised from obscurity to be the *second* in rank and dignity, above the ancient Sees of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, according to the ruling of the Second General Council—"Let the Bishop of Constantinople have the precedence of honour next to the Bishop of Rome, for as much as it is New Rome." This was endorsed on the same ground by the Council of Chalcedon, A.D. 451. And Rome was not only the largest city—she was without a rival—queen of the world, as she was frequently called, the centre of life, intellect, power, and law Every one who could visited Rome, and thus a constant communication was maintained between the Church of Rome and all provincial Churches, whose members often visited the scenes of the apostolic martyrdoms, and were brought in contact with the Bishop. Moreover, the Church at Rome was wealthy and generous, ever ready to assist a struggling Church, and thus gaining affection and influence to itself. These causes are more than sufficient to account for the rapid growth in influence of the Church at Rome during the first ages of Christianity, and of its Metropolitan Bishop, or Pope, as *all* Metropolitan Bishops were at that time called.

SECOND PERIOD.—At the beginning of the fourth century the Roman emperors resided chiefly at Constantinople. Jovian was the last emperor of

the whole empire. At his decease the empire was divided (A.D. 364). Valentinian became the ruler of the Western kingdom, residing at Milan, whilst his brother Valens became the emperor of the East, and resided at Constantinople. The Western empire, weakened by this division, was overrun by barbarous hordes, who settled on Roman territory and formed new nations, to the ultimate extinction of the empire of the West, Augustulus being its last emperor (A.D. 476). Meanwhile the Bishop of Rome grew in importance. The emperors had become Christian, and the heathen temples were given to the bishops for Christian worship. Leo the Great was a strong man (440–461), and the emperor of his day, Valentinian III., frequently troubled by ecclesiastical questions, organised the Church after the civil constitution of the empire. Leo obtained from him a decree establishing the supreme legislative and judicial authority of the Roman See over the entire Church. It appeared at the time to be a wise and judicious act, but its consequences were not foreseen. It really destroyed the equal brotherhood of the Churches which had previously existed, and virtually established the Papacy in the West. The seed was sown for the schisms of later times.[1]

THIRD PERIOD—GREGORY THE GREAT (594).—Gregory was a good and earnest man, devoutly

[1] Church Hist. Soc. Tracts, xiii. p. 254.

anxious to spread the kingdom of God for the conversion of the world. Circumstances again led to an increase of the Pope's temporal and spiritual power during his episcopate. The Western Roman empire had ceased to exist. Thus the Pope of Rome became the visible centre of Western Christendom, for the Eternal City could not fail to add lustre and power to its bishop. His intercourse with the barbaric invaders was judicious and successful. By his wise and skilful negotiation with the Lombards he gained not only peace for Italy, but the devotion of the Roman States. Yet with this increase of power, almost forced upon him, he rejected the ambitious claim, which the Bishop of Constantinople had assumed, of "Universal Bishop," calling it "a proud and foolish word"; declaring that **the assumption of it by any bishop was an imitation of the devil, who exalted himself above his fellow-angels; that it was unlike the behaviour of St. Peter, who, although first of the Apostles, did not pretend to be more than of the same class with the rest**; and more to the same effect, showing that this great and pious man, so far from believing the pretension which the Roman Church afterwards claimed, repudiated the very idea, calling it "a token of Antichrist's speedy coming."[1]

But the temptation to convert the Church, as the

[1] See Robertson's "Growth of the Papal Power," p. 125.

visible kingdom of God, into a rival of earthly states and kingdoms became too great for some of Gregory's successors. The followers of Mohammed in the seventh century almost destroyed the once flourishing Churches of Jerusalem, Antioch, and Alexandria, conquering Syria and the whole of Northern Africa, thereby removing those metropolitans who in the early ages kept in check the ambition of the Roman bishops.[1] The Roman Pope stood pre-eminent, with no Italian monarch to control or interfere with him. Pope Zachary realised the position and its opportunity. The Franks wished Pepin, the Mayor of the Palace, to be their king, and asked the religious sanction of Zachary to their desire. This was granted; the dynasty of the Merovingians was thrust aside, and Pepin became king of France. In return for this sanction and influence of the Pope, Pepin, at the request of Stephen, the succeeding Pope, delivered him from the attacks of the Lombards (755), and handed over to Stephen the cities and territory which he seized from them. By this gift the Roman bishop became a temporal prince. Charlemagne, Pepin's son and successor, added largely to the donation which Pepin had given to the Papacy. He was crowned by Leo III. on Christmas day (A.D. 800), in St. Peter's, as Emperor of the Romans.

The Papacy was now fairly launched upon its

[1] It is said that 300 dioceses in Northern Africa were effaced.

career of gaining, if possible, both temporal and spiritual supremacy. These were indeed the Dark Ages. Greek literature was ignored. The nobles were frequently unable to read or write. Ecclesiastics were almost the only educated class, and they used their superior knowledge to exalt their own order and the Papacy. When Nicolas I. became Pope, certain forgeries were palmed upon the Roman Church, which Nicolas, with little inquiry, accepted as authentic. The most famous, or rather infamous, of these were the forged "Isidorian Decretals" and the spurious "Donation of Constantine."[1] By means of these Pope Nicolas asserted his authority over the whole of Christendom and over the nations and rulers of the world. The claim was resisted by the Patriarch of Constantinople, resulting in a quarrel which ultimately separated the Greek Church from Western Christendom. The Papacy had grown into a tyranny.

FOURTH PERIOD.—The Papacy made great advances under the sway of the Italian monk Hildebrand, who became Pope, A.D. 1073, under the title of Gregory VII. There are those who consider that "we ought to see not mere reckless and meaningless personal arrogance and self-assertion"[2] in Gregory VII. and his imitators, Adrian IV. and

[1] These documents bear internal evidence of their spuriousness, nd are now acknowledged by Romanists to be forgeries.

[2] London Diocesan Ch. Lectures, ii.

Innocent III., but men who endeavoured to work out a grand idea that the world could only be secured for Christ by the supremacy in Church and State of the Pope as Christ's earthly representative. The idea was a fascinating one, and its place in the mind of a pious Pope may possibly be allowed. But the aim was unattainable, and the means taken to embody and realise it expose its utter impossibility in the present conditions of human nature. Gregory's idea involved the supremacy of the Pope over all secular princes, with power to depose kings and absolve subjects from their allegiance. He assumed that all kingdoms were held as fiefs under himself, and that all princes and rulers were bound to kiss his feet. So also Gregory asserted that he was universal bishop, authorised to depose other bishops at his pleasure; all appeals to him must be respected, whilst the Pope himself is above all judgment. These extravagant pretensions he maintained chiefly by setting one king against another. His pride, or the falsehood of his theory, brought its retribution in the appointment of an anti-pope, and by his being compelled to leave Rome. He died in exile. Innocent III. asserted the same prerogatives, and carried them out with relentless vigour. He is known in English history by his excommunication of King John for protesting against his interference in the appointment of an archbishop. He laid the whole country under

an interdict, and incited Philip Augustus of France to invade the land. Two other incidents are even less to his credit. The Pope made use of the Crusades to distract the minds of princes under the laudable plea of seeking to rescue the holy places from the infidels; but one of these he suffered to fight against the Greek Christians of Constantinople in order to bend them to the Latin yoke. His further action of stirring up a crusade against the Albigenses, in which thousands of lives were wantonly sacrificed, testifies to the power and cruelty of this ambitious ruler of the "whole Church and the whole world."

The same pretensions were put forth by Boniface VIII. (A.D. 1294). But with this pontificate came the reaction. "The Papacy had for the most part succeeded against the emperors of the Holy Roman Empire, but it was no match for the kingdoms of the new empire, backed as they were by the growing vigour of national life." Kings and princes discovered that Popes were as human as themselves, as ambitious, covetous, tyrannical, immoral, cruel, and unjust. When Boniface demanded that Philip the Fair of France should accept the crown as a fief of St. Peter, in other words, as a gift from himself, the French people rose in anger and indignation. Lewis of France asserted that "the king of France holdeth of no one but of God and of his own sword." In England the same independence began more

openly to show itself. Laws were made against the Papal encroachments, the monstrous exactions of annates, and of the appointment of foreigners to bishoprics who drew the incomes, and sometimes never entered their sees. Complaints were made of the low morals of many Popes and ecclesiastics. Universities had been founded, and thought and reason were being set free. Wyclif and others were promoting the reading of the Word of God, and thus by many conspiring causes the way was being prepared for the Reformation, which closed the history of Papal supremacy in the world. Boniface lived to see the violent overthrow of all his pretensions. He died at Rome in misery too horrible to relate.

Its history is as purely human, natural, and the result of circumstances as the rise and growth of any secular kingdom. The Divine right of Popes is as unfounded as the Divine right of kings. When the supremacy had done the work for which it was providentially permitted, it passed away. Allowing that possibly a lofty Christian idea of establishing a visible kingdom of God to rule the world may have animated the minds and actions of certain Popes, it was an idea, a theory, destined to fail, if not even to increase the evils which it professed a desire to cure. No Pope was above human nature, so that the agents were necessarily incomplete and unworthy, whilst the object was a vain attempt to

anticipate what is reserved unto the advent of our Redeemer as "King of kings and Lord of lords." Then, and not till then, will "*The kingdom of this world become our Lord's and His Christ's*" (Apoc. xi. 15, D).

Note.—It is only fair to mention that some regard 1 Pet. v. 13 as containing an allegorical allusion to Rome under the symbol of Babylon. Symbolism does not seem in character with the rest of the Epistle. See Alford's "Greek Testament," *in loco.*

[With regard to Rome and persecution it is well to remember that the late Monsignor Benson in his Preface to the "Life of Pope Pius V." declared that physical torture by an Inquisitor was "no more or no less intolerant than the cross examination of a witness in a Court of Law."

The Jesuit, Von Hammerstein, in his "Church and State" (1886), taught that death by burning is the only effectual remedy for the extirpation of heresy.

In 1901 the Vatican issued a work on Papal Law by Prof. M. de Luca, which claims that the Church has the right to put heretics to death, because mere excommunication and other punishments are ineffective.

Prof. Lepicier, of the Propaganda College in Rome, published a book in 1908 in which he lays down a rule that "if a man publicly professes a heretical doctrine, or attempts to pervert others, by teaching or example," he may be "with justice killed," and "the Church has the right to bring heretics to death, even if repentant."]

PART II

ROMAN ERRORS AS FORMULATED IN THE CREED OF POPE PIUS IV. AND THE NEW DOGMA OF THE IMMACULATE CONCEPTION

XI

THE CREED OF POPE PIUS IV. AND THE COUNCIL OF TRENT

Q.—What is the origin of the Creed of Pope Pius IV.? When was it composed, and of what authority is it in the Church of Rome?

A.—The Creed of Pope Pius IV. is the authorised and accepted Creed of the Roman Church. It consists of twelve articles, each of which is imposed under pain of anathema, the whole Creed forming a concise summary of the doctrines enunciated at the Council of Trent.

That Council was the outcome of a general desire felt and expressed in the sixteenth century by kings and people for a reform in the morals of the Papacy and in the exactions and burdens which it inflicted upon Christian states. The Popes themselves were the chief offenders. Alexander VI., who was Pope at the close of the fifteenth and the beginning of the sixteenth century, was one of the most profligate of men. Froude declares that "rapes, murders, debaucheries, cruelties exceeding those of Nero and Caligula, were committed without disguise in the

Vatican itself under the eyes of the Pope" (quoting from Burkhard's diary); indulgences were sold in the churches to provide portions for the Pope's daughter Lucretia. Julius II., the successor to Alexander, was another monster, who filled Europe with war and bloodshed. Leo X. was more heathen than Christian; he is credited with the remark that "Christianity was a profitable fable." Paul III. had a family of illegitimate children. He gave the duchies of Parma and Piacenza to his bastard son Lewis, and made two of his grandsons cardinals at the ages of fourteen and fifteen respectively, while Paul IV. surpassed all his predecessors in nepotism. Such were some of the Popes at the Reformation period.[1]

The example of the Popes produced licentiousness everywhere. Immorality prevailed in many of the nunneries and abbeys, as in the English abbey of St. Albans, alleged and proved by Cardinal Morton. No wonder that the laity cried out for reform, and demanded a General Council of the whole Church for the rectification of abuses; and perhaps it may be said, No wonder that the Popes and cardinals resisted the exposure of their own crimes. At last, under the peremptory demands and pressure of the Emperor Charles V., Pope Paul III. yielded, but with the evident determination to thwart every

[1] See Froude's "History of the Council of Trent," Lecture I., and p. 118.

effort for reformation in morals or doctrine. The Council of bishops and abbots was summoned to meet at Trent, a small town in the Austrian Tyrol. The first session was held on December 13, 1545, when only twenty-six bishops and archbishops were present, with five generals of orders and envoys from the Emperor and King of the Romans. At the fourth session new arrivals raised the number to thirty; but instead of considering "morals" (the one object for which the Council had been demanded), the bishops discussed the authority of tradition and Scripture, and, in succeeding sessions, original sin, justification, eucharist, &c. The rumoured outbreak of an epidemic afforded an excuse for the adjournment of the Council, which was accordingly suspended on April 28, 1552.

After a space of ten years the Council was again summoned by Pope Pius IV., and met on Easter Day, 1561. There were present 106 bishops, 4 abbots, 4 generals of orders, the Duke of Mantua, and the Emperor's legate. Again the question of morals was evaded, except that the sale of indulgences was somewhat restricted. The time of the Council was, as before, chiefly occupied with the more definite enforcement of erroneous doctrines, which were summed up and are now stereotyped in the creed called the Creed of Pope Pius IV.

The Council really possessed no authority, seeing that it laboured under two fatal defects—it was

neither catholic nor free. Pius IV. indeed called it a "General and Œcumenical Council," but Henry II., king of France, at the time justly denied that it was a General Council, as it was not accessible to the French bishops, and he more correctly called it a "convention." Nor was it "free" for a moment. It was hampered and fettered by the constant attendance of a large majority of Italian bishops, most of whom had their maintenance given by the Pope, and who were the Pope's creatures—mere titular bishops without sees or jurisdiction. At the later sessions of the Council there were: Italians 189, Spaniards 31, French 26, German 2, Portuguese 3, Illyrian 3, Irish 3, Flemish 2, Polish 2, Croatian 1, Moravian 1, English 1. There were no representatives of the Greek Church. The six Greek bishops present were Roman titular bishops. The Roman Catholic dictionary says honestly, "The Italian prelates constituted more than half the Council." Such a packed assembly had no authority, being neither catholic nor free.

The errors of this Council, which have been endorsed by the Church of Rome in the Creed of Pius IV., form the subject of the following questions.

XII

ROME'S RESTRICTED USE OF THE BIBLE

Q.—Is it true that the Roman Church puts such restrictions upon the reading of the Bible that the great mass of her members seldom use it either for instruction or devotion?

A.—It is too true. The fourth rule of the Congregation of the Index of Prohibited Books, approved by Pius IV., and *still* in force, runs as follows:—"Since it is manifest by experience that if the Holy Bible in the vulgar tongue be suffered to be read everywhere without distinction, more evil than good arises. Let the judgment of the bishop or inquisitor be abided by in this respect, so that, after consulting with the parish priest or the confessor, they may grant permission to read translations of the Scriptures, made by Catholic writers, to those whom they understand to be able to receive no harm, but an increase of faith and piety from such reading (which faculty let them have in writing). But whosoever shall presume to read these Bibles, or have them in possession without such faculty, shall not be capable of receiving absolution of their sins, unless they have

first given up the Bibles to the Ordinary." And this prohibition has been followed up by recent declarations. Pope Leo XII., in an Encyclical dated May 3, 1824, addressed the Latin bishops thus:— "We also, venerable brothers, in conformity with our apostolic duty, exhort you to turn away your flocks from these *poisonous pastures* (*i.e.* vernacular Bibles). Reprove, entreat, be instant in season and out of season, that the faithful committed to you (adhering strictly to the rules of the Congregation of the Index) be persuaded that if the Sacred Scriptures be everywhere indiscriminately published, more evil than advantage will arise thence, because of the rashness of men." And this difficulty in the way of the reading of Holy Scripture by the Roman laity is further increased by the second article in the Creed of Pius IV.: "I do admit the Holy Scriptures in the same sense that Holy Mother Church hath held and doth hold, whose business it is to judge of the true sense and interpretation of them. Nor will I ever receive or interpret them except according to the *unanimous consent of the Fathers.*" The laity are aware that "Holy Mother Church" publishes no commentaries on Holy Scripture, nor "authorised interpretation" of Holy Writ; and as to "the *unanimous* consent of the fathers," they are aware that the fathers freely commented on Scripture, each according to his ability, so that their "*unanimous* consent" does not exist. These condi-

tions effectually close the door upon the Word of God.

It is sad, it is astonishing, it seems inexplicable that any body of Christians should hold back the Scriptures, which God has given for His children's special light and instruction. It is amazing that a revelation pertaining to the relation of the sinner to his God, with a message of salvation—which is rightly called the GOSPEL, because it was intended to bring to all people "*tidings of great joy*"—should be treated as a book of mystery and danger. Perhaps still more amazing is it that such multitudes should submit to the deprivation, and show so little zeal in reading for themselves the message of reconciliation sent from heaven, and in studying even the four Gospels, which contain the record of the incarnation, of the life, the teaching, the atoning death and glorious resurrection and ascension of Him whose name they bear, even Christ, our loving, redeeming Lord. Surely such treatment of revelation is most dishonouring to God and fatal to the full enlightenment and happiness of man. St. John tells us of the Gospels, "*These are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye might have life through His name.*"[1] St. Paul, that the Holy Scriptures "*are able to make us wise unto salvation, through faith which is in Christ Jesus.*" That Timothy had known them from his

[1] John xx. 31.

childhood, having been taught them by his grandmother Lois and mother Eunice, showing that they were the family text-book of religion in his day.[1] St. Peter reminds us that we have a "*more sure word of prophecy, whereunto we do well that we take heed,*" meaning the Sacred Scriptures, of which he further declares that they "*came not in old time by the will of man, but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost;*"[2] and throughout the Bible there is the injunction and expectation that *all* should know and study the revelation which God had vouchsafed to give for their peace, guidance, conduct, and education for immortality.[3]

No Compensation in Roman Liturgy.—Rome does not compensate for this discouragement of the private reading of the Bible by her public services. She has no Book of Common Prayer such as the Anglican Church possesses; no chapters are read aloud in the vernacular, as in all Protestant Churches at every service, whereby in some churches the Old Testament may be read through once in the year and the New Testament twice. Rome has no such *consecutive* Bible-reading for her people. A few short passages occur in her Breviary, but these are read by the priest in Latin, not in the vernacular. A distinguished French Romanist, struck with the fact that the children of the Church knew "the

[1] 2 Tim. iii. 15–17. [2] 2 Peter i. 19–21.
[3] Deut. iv.; Matt. xxii. 29; Rom. iii. 2.

Divine Book only in fragments, without logical or chronological order," brought out a translation of the four Gospels, for which he obtained the sanction of the Archbishop of Paris and of the Pope.[1] The result was an immediate sale of 100,000 copies, so eager for this novel work were the French Romanists. But the Index shortly interfered. The Pope's express sanction was withdrawn, the printing and the sale peremptorily stopped, under the pretext that some passages were translated inaccurately. The fragments in Latin were preferred as *safer* than the whole in a language every one could understand!

ROME THE ONLY CHURCH WHICH ACTS THUS.—The Greek Church, with its 80 or 90 millions of members, circulates the Bible, and her members annually purchase a large number of copies from the British and Foreign Bible Society. The Lutheran, Scandinavian, and English Churches throughout the world can boast of a Bible in almost every cottage and mansion, and of its possession by almost every child. These Churches recognise it to be the mind and will of God that His revelation should be known by all. They observe that the great majority of quotations in the New Testament from the Old follow the Septuagint, the Greek translation of the Old Testament, as the vernacular in those days. They recall the purer days when the Bible was translated into Latin, and regard that Latin Vulgate (which

[1] Traduction Nouvelle, par Henri Lasserre, 27th edit., 1887.

Rome by the Tridentine Decree, Sess. iv., infallibly declared to be authentic) as evidence against herself in not providing translations into the present spoken languages of the world. It is said that Roman Catholic versions of the Vulgate are now published in most of the languages of Europe, but their circulation is not promoted, and the restrictions mentioned are imposed wherever the priests have the power. The editions always have notes. They appear to have been printed to prevent scandal rather than in the confidence of faith.

The contrast between Romanists and Protestants is even more marked in MISSIONARY work. Protestants have translated the Bible, in whole or in part, into upwards of 240*languages and dialects of the heathen, amongst whom they have established missions; they honour the Word of God and they trust it. Rome has made only *two* translations, and those not spontaneously, but because the inquirers *insisted* upon their possession. These two are for Uganda and for Japan. The large number of Protestant converts compelled the Roman missioners to accede to the demands of their own inquirers and converts that they should possess the wonderful Book which their fellow-countrymen were reading.[1] All non-Roman Churches endorse the noble words of Erasmus, a Romanist, who was alive to the

* 1927, now 600 languages.

[1] These are the only instances in modern missions that the writer has heard of. If others exist, he will be glad to be informed of them.

errors in faith and morals which had followed its neglect:—

"Let us consider what kind of hearers Christ Himself had. Were they not a promiscuous multitude, among them the blind, the halt . . . beggars, publicans, centurions, workmen, and even boys? . . . If Christ did not exclude them from hearing His voice, neither will I exclude them from reading His books. . . . I would that they were translated into every language. For Christ desired His holy philosophy to be propagated as widely as possible. As He died for all, so He wished to be known by all." [1]

THE FATHERS URGE THE READING OF THE SCRIPTURES.—If there is such a thing as "the unanimous consent of the Fathers," it is in their testimony to the Scriptures as the rule of faith and the desire that *all* should study them. Where all are agreed the quotations may be few. Thus Clemens Alexandrinus (A.D. 216): "We look not for the testimony that is from men, but we confirm that which is questioned by the voice of God, which is . . . the only demonstration." St. Cyril of Jerusalem—"How shall we perceive and class among truths that which the Divine Scripture hath not said?" St. Chrysostom in his sermons, which are usually expository, urges his hearers to read the portion at home before they attend his sermons. He rebukes the excuse of the working-man that he cannot afford to buy a Bible.

[1] Preface in St. Matthew.

He urges that they can afford to buy their tools, and are careful never to part with them. "Is it not a shame," he says, "if, where the tools of this world's trades are concerned, you make no excuse of poverty, but take care that no impediment shall interfere with your retaining them; here, where such unspeakable benefits are to be reaped, you whine about your want of leisure and your poverty."[1] And such is his constant habit of appealing to Scripture and urging it upon the people. Rome endeavours to evade these constant appeals to the Bible as the standard of doctrine by quotations in which the Fathers refer to the tradition of the Church in connection with the Scriptures. But the object of these references must be clearly understood. They wrote when the young Church was beset by heresies; when the powers of darkness were leagued against Christ and His Gospel; when Judaism, Heathenism, Gnosticism were perverting the Scriptures and producing *false* versions of the Gospels to mislead the people. The defence of the faithful was an appeal to those Churches which were founded by apostles or martyrs, in which the *original* Scriptures had been always read and the *original* teaching of the apostles handed down. Here was no appeal to Church authority in the Roman sense, but to *historical* records and *historical* evidence, which was the meaning of tradition in those early days of Christianity. Thus Tertullian makes an appeal to

[1] Quoted in Salmon's "Infallibility," pp. 119, 120.

the Apostolic Churches to show that the authentic versions of the Scriptures have been preserved in the chief churches of the Christian world from their foundation, and kept from corruption by an unbroken succession of careful custodians and teachers. The Fathers never dreamed of limiting or restricting the reading of the pure Word of God, but they were jealous that it should be kept pure.

ROME'S EXCUSES.—The formal restrictions of Rome, as given in the Index of Prohibited Books, simply assert that "more evil than good" arises from reading the Scriptures in the vernacular." Modern Roman manuals and apologies for Roman doctrines are more definite in their reasons. Thus, Father Ryder, in his answer to Dr. Littledale, asserts, "The Society's Bibles are 'poisonous pastures' (to use Leo XII.'s word) . . . because they represent the principle of *heresy in their rejection of the Church's canon*[1] and interpretation"; whilst another writer[2] declares, "The Church condemns, rejects, and anathematises in every shape and form the idea that every man has a right to interpret the Scriptures for himself." Again, "In Catholic (Roman Catholic) countries, therefore, certain restrictions are placed on reading the Scriptures in the vernacular. *In England it is not so.* The condition of the country seems to make such restrictions undesirable, and therefore, in practice, each

[1] See chap. xiii., p. 95.

[2] "The Threshold of the Catholic Faith," 237, 238.

one is allowed to use his own discretion, remembering always, however, *the principles* on which restrictions are founded."

The indignant words of Lactantius are the simple answer to these weak suggestions of heresy, division, diversity of opinion, as likely to arise from the reading of God's Holy Word—"Is not God, the creator of the mind and voice and tongue, able to speak clearly? Undoubtedly He is: and by His Divine Providence He willed that His Divine truth should be void of all disguise, that all might understand what was spoken alike to all."[1] Truly the Bible is simplicity itself when compared with the diversities of interpretation called forth by mere human compositions. Take infallibility. So many are the explanations and opinions given by Roman writers respecting the doctrine that F. Ryder says apologetically—"No conceivable enactment of a general principle, as *long as it is couched in human language*, can preclude all question as to the particular instance." The interpretations of Rome, therefore, her doctrines and her dogmas, "being *couched in human language*," will and do present difficulties as much as the Bible. Nay, surely greater; for reverence must oblige every one to believe that the inspired teachings of the Holy Ghost must be conveyed in language more exact and definite than

[1] See Canon Jenkins' "Romanism," p. 74.

the mere human conceptions of fallible men, and therefore more easily to be understood.

ONLY ONE TEXT APPEALED TO BY ROME.—In opposition to the constant exhortations of the Fathers that all Christians should read the Bible, and the solemn demands of Christ and the apostles to the same effect, Rome brings forward one solitary passage, in which St. Peter, alluding to St. Paul's Epistles as corroborating his own words, adds, "*In which* (Epistles) *are some things hard to be understood, which they that are unlearned and unstable wrest, as they do also the other Scriptures, unto their own destruction*" (2 Peter iii. 16). On which it may be observed: (1.) that the "unlearned" are not the only persons who wrest the Scriptures; in all probability theologians and dreamers, or seers of visions, have been the most guilty: (2.) that St. Peter in his words of warning as to not perverting the Word of God does not suggest the slightest restriction as to its use: and (3.) that of St. Peter's own additions to the Scriptures, his first Epistle is directed to the *Jewish dispersion* in many lands, and his second to all *those who had the same faith and hope as himself*, through Jesus Christ—evidently intending his letters to be read by all Christians —Jews or Gentiles.

Rome's treatment of the Bible, her restrictions upon its private reading where she can or dares, her fragmentary selections for the public services

in an unknown tongue, leave an uneasy suspicion that she regards the "*living oracles of God*" as unfavourable to her claims and to her doctrines.

Let it be thankfully acknowledged that many are now reading the Bible in Romish countries in spite of the discouragement of their Church. Amongst ourselves, the devout and strong common-sense of the English character, the light of the Gospel shining from every Protestant home, has been too much for Rome's discouragement and disapproval.[1] "IN ENGLAND IT IS NOT SO," says Dr. Bagshawe, reluctantly and with evident annoyance. But what Rome cannot effect by compulsion she endeavours to effect by other means—by "Livres de piété,"[2] which gradually supersede the daily reading of God's Word, as manuals are apt to do in some instances in other Churches. Let every English Christian maintain his birthright of an open Bible, if he would be loyal to Christ, the Great Head of the Church, and be sure as to God's revealed plan of salvation and the proper guidance of his life.

[1] See chap. xlvii.

[2] Devotional Manuals: Prayers to Mary, Joseph, &c.

XIII

THE CANONICAL BOOKS AND THE APOCRYPHA

Q.—Is there not a difference between the Scriptures acknowledged by Protestants and those received by Romanists? On what grounds do Protestants consider their own canon[1] to be the most correct?

A.—All branches of the Catholic Church are agreed upon the canon of the New Testament. But as regards the Old Testament, Protestants receive as the Word of God those Scriptures, and THOSE ONLY, which were so recognised by our Lord and His apostles, and by the Palestinian Jews of that age. The expression "the Scriptures" had as definite a meaning in apostolic times as with ourselves. It referred to the books of the Old Testament, and to these our Saviour always appealed as authoritative in His discourses with the Jews. Wherever our Lord mentions them (Matt. xxi. 42, xxii. 29, Luke xxiv. 44, John v. 39), or the apostles

[1] The Greek word "canon" signifies a rule or standard by which things are to be judged. It is applied to those Scriptures which have ever been esteemed in the Church as the infallible rule of faith and conduct.

(St. Paul, 2 Tim. iii. 15, St. Peter, 2 Peter i. 20), they are alluded to as books *sui generis*, the very books which are included in the English Bible. They form the sum of the revelations made to Israel, and through them to the world, from Moses to Malachi. Their possession by the Jews is mentioned as their great privilege; so that when it is asked (Rom. iii. 2), "*What advantage hath the Jew?*" the answer is given, "*Much every way: chiefly because that unto them were committed the oracles of God.*" Some seven hundred quotations are made in the New Testament from these sacred writings, and from *none others*, whilst no hint is ever given as to their having been tampered with in any way. The Jews had been the faithful guardians of this Divine deposit; they became almost superstitious in their care of them, reckoning up the words, and even the letters, in each book, and destroying any manuscript in which errors of transcription had accidentally occurred.

These "Scriptures" were written in Hebrew, with the exception of a few portions which were written in Chaldee.

THE APOCRYPHA.—With many editions of the Bible there are bound up several books called the Apocrypha. These books did not exist in the Hebrew original of the Old Testament used by our Lord; they are not once referred to by Him, nor were they ever recognised by the Jews of Palestine.

Their history is this.[1] Great numbers of Jews had settled in different parts of the East long before the coming of Christ. The majority of those carried into captivity never returned from Babylon, and Jewish colonies[2] were widely scattered, especially over those parts where Greek only was spoken. One very large colony was at Alexandria. These Jews were anxious to possess the Scriptures in their own tongue, as the Hebrew had ceased to be a spoken language, so they had them translated into Greek in the version called the Septuagint (about 300 B.C.). These Alexandrian Jews had some writings of their own which they valued, because they contained records of events which occurred after the silence of the prophetic voice in Malachi. They did not give to them the same authority as to the Hebrew Scriptures, which they received equally with the Palestinian Jews, but they regarded them with affection, and gave them a certain place of honour, reading them at times in their assemblies. When these Alexandrian Jews became Christian, they retained the apocryphal books attached to their Old Testament and added other apocryphal books to the New. In course of time the Greek language was superseded by the Latin in the West, and, in their ignorance of Hebrew, Latin translations were taken,

[1] See Dr. Wace on the Apocrypha. Also, The Value of the Apocrypha, by the Rev. Wm. C. Procter. Thynne & Jarvis, Ltd., 3s. net.

[2] James i. 1: "To the twelve tribes scattered abroad," &c. 1 Peter i. 1: "To the strangers scattered throughout Pontus," &c.

not from the original Hebrew, but from the Greek version, and the Apocrypha was translated with it. Most of the early Christian Fathers had no knowledge of Hebrew, and read only these Greek or Latin versions, yet frequently making a distinction between the inspired Scriptures used by our Lord and the apocryphal books.

ST. JEROME'S TRANSLATION (A.D. 404).—The first of the Fathers who understood Hebrew was the learned Jerome. In his day the Latin versions had become corrupt. He therefore translated the whole Bible from the original languages—the Old Testament from the Hebrew and Chaldee, and the New Testament from the Greek.[1] The study led him to examine the canon of Scripture very carefully, with the result that he rejected the Apocrypha from the canon of inspired Scripture, stating that "the Church doth read them (the apocryphal books) for example of life and instruction of manners, but yet it doth not apply them to establish any doctrine."[2] His judgment coincided with that of Philo and Josephus (who lived about the time of Christ), of Melito[3] (A.D. 160), confirmed by the Jewish Talmud in the fifth century, by the great Roman Catholic Cardinal Cajetan (1518), and the learned

[1] This translation is called the Latin *Vulgate*, because it was meant for the vulgar, *i.e.* the *common* people.

[2] See Article VI., Church of England.

[3] Melito was Bishop of Sardis. He travelled in the East to investigate the subject of the canon of Scripture.

Roman Catholic Archbishop Ximenes, to whom we owe the famous Complutensian Polyglot (1517), and other eminent authorities. St. Augustine (A.D. 420) was the chief man of note who differed from St. Jerome. Great as he was in doctrine and as an evangelic preacher, he was ignorant of Hebrew and disliked the thought of revision, so that his judgment is of no weight in the matter.

COUNCIL OF TRENT.—This variety of opinion as to the Apocrypha existed up to the time of the Council of Trent, which met A.D. 1545, and took for its first subject of deliberation the question of the Scriptures. The Council was called Œcumenical (general), as if it represented the whole Christian Church. Never was any Council so unreal or so unworthy of the name. Only thirty bishops were present from all Christendom to consider a subject so important as the true canon of the Word of God. None of the thirty knew Hebrew,[1] and only a few Greek; they were therefore utterly incompetent to sift the evidence. These passed a decree, approved by the Council, that the apocryphal books were of the same authority as the canonical Scriptures—except Esdras and the prayer of Manasses—and that under pain of anathema.

The reason why these unscholarly men passed the decree is only too evident. The Scriptures which our Lord stamped with His authority gave no sup-

[1] Wace's Introduction to the Apocrypha.

port to the Roman doctrines of prayer for the dead or to the intercession of angels, to purgatory or merits, but a few stray passages might be found in the apocryphal books to give some feeble colouring to these errors. Hence the determination to place the apocryphal books and tradition on a level with God's Word.

Surely non-Roman Churches have acted rightly in accepting only the Scriptures sanctioned by our Lord as the inspired Word of God, admitting the Apocrypha as of general moral and ecclesiastical interest, although not of sufficient authority to establish any doctrine.

[For a full history of the Apocrypha, its historical, doctrinal and eschatological teaching, see *The Value of the Apocrypha*, by the Rev. Wm. C. Procter, F.Ph. Thynne & Jarvis, Ltd., 3s. net.]

XIV

TRADITION OF EQUAL AUTHORITY WITH SCRIPTURE

Q.—The Church of Rome appeals to Tradition in behalf of many of her doctrines. Is Tradition to be regarded as a sufficient authority in matters of faith?

A.—No authority could be less reliable than the traditions received by the Church of Rome. The Council of Trent decreed (Session IV.): "Seeing clearly that this (saving) truth and (moral) discipline are contained in the written books and the unwritten traditions received by the apostles from the mouth of Christ Himself or from the apostles themselves, the Holy Ghost dictating, have come down even unto us, transmitted as it were from hand to hand;" and again: "Every sort of doctrine which is to be delivered to the faithful is contained in the Word of God, which is divided into Scripture and Tradition."[1] In face of such stupendous assertions, every one is justified in asking for clear evidence. Where is this "tradition" to be found? Has it been recorded and registered by Rome? Where is the digest and proof of it for the faithful

[1] Catechism of Council of Trent, sect. xii.

to examine? How is it tested? How is it shown to be necessary? Everything about it is vague and uncertain, yet if given "from the mouth of Christ," "the Holy Ghost dictating," and a division or portion "contained in the Word of God," it ought to be as definite, limited, and demonstrable as that written Word of God which is called the Bible. Surely after so many centuries it ought to be published and accessible to all. But Rome gives no answer to such simple and important inquiries. Sometimes she asserts that all is not recorded, evidently wishing to retain a hidden margin for dogmas that may be unfolded in the future; sometimes she refers to the decrees of councils and writings of the ancients, the compilation of which, by the Abbé Migne, called "The Catholic Tradition," amounts to 220 thick volumes, and many other works must also be added.[1] But what says the Scripture?

USE AND DANGER OF TRADITION ACCORDING TO SCRIPTURE.—The word "tradition" is used in two distinct applications in the New Testament: (1) To signify the oral teaching given by the apostles themselves to the Churches which they founded, and sometimes equivalent to what would be called preaching in the present day. The word is so used twice by St. Paul: "*Keep the ordinances* ("traditions" in the Greek) *as I delivered them to you*" (1 Cor. xi. 2) and "*not after the tradition which they received of us*"

[1] Canon Jenkins.

(2 Thess. iii. 6). The use here evidently refers to the ordinary teaching of the Apostle in his personal communications with his converts, differing in no sense from the letters which he wrote. It is to be remarked that we find no appeal from the Fathers to any unwritten words or teaching of St. Paul, although he was always spoken of by them as "*the* Apostle." (2) The other references to tradition (in the Romish usage) are always full of disparagement and warning. They refer to the popular belief amongst the Jews in our Lord's time that Moses, under the inspiration of God, gave utterance on Mount Sinai to a large number of instructions and directions which were never written, but "handed down" orally from generation to generation. These were regarded as a second revelation; they grew in the transmission, as all oral traditions are wont to do, and deteriorated in the process by the same rule or tendency, corrupting the religion of priests and people, and gradually superseding the written Word of God. This *unwritten* tradition Christ condemned: "*Why do you also transgress the commandment of God for your tradition?*" and "*You have made void the commandment of God for your tradition*" (Matt. xv. 3–6, D.). St. Paul warned the Colossians, "*Beware lest any man impose upon you by philosophy and vain fallacy, according to the tradition of men, and not according to Christ*" (Col. ii. 8, D.); and St. Peter gives similar warning: "*Your vain conversation of the*

tradition of your fathers" (1 Peter i. 18, D.). The two doctrines, of the Pharisees and of Rome, run on precisely parallel lines and have resulted in similar dangers. Both claim to have been revealed by God; both profess to have been transmitted from hand to hand; both have grown indefinitely; both have contradicted and largely superseded those Scriptures which our blessed Lord alone endorsed as the Word of God. The only test of the truth contained in a tradition must be its agreement with the written Word, for the Holy Ghost cannot deny Himself. St. Cyprian said truly, "Tradition without truth is but the antiquity of error."

But ROMAN TRADITION CONTRADICTS SCRIPTURE.—Christ commanded at the institution of the Lord's Supper, "*Drink ye* ALL *of this.*" Rome contradicts, suffering no lay person to receive the wine, nor even a priest unless he is the celebrant. "How can this be?" asks the ingenuous Christian. When Christ said "ALL," could He mean "NONE"? Tradition is brought in to support the unwarrantable change, and the Saviour's condemnation rings like a knell upon the heart, "*Ye have made* MY *word*—the word of your God—*of none effect by your traditions.*" There is in this the same perverseness as in the contradiction of the fifth commandment by the Pharisees—the commandment that children should honour and support their parents—which the Pharisees annulled by their tradition (Mark vii. 11), that if

the children made their property "*corban*"—a gift devoted to God or the Church—they were free from their filial responsibility. The doctrines of purgatory, of indulgences, of penance, infallibility, and the like unscriptural novelties, are in like manner mainly supported by tradition, and not by any authority from God's written Word. No apostolic tradition can be found in support of them.

TRADITION NOT TRUSTED BY THE FATHERS.—The testimony of the Fathers to the completeness and sufficiency of the written Word has been already given (see pp. 89, 90). The following quotations aptly apply to this subject of tradition. Origen—"In the two Testaments every word that appertaineth unto God may be sought and discussed, and out of them all knowledge of things may be understood. **And if anything remains which Holy Scripture doth not determine, no other third Scripture ought to be received to authorise any knowledge, but we must commit to the fire what remains, i.e. reserve it unto God."**[1] **So Basil—"It is a manifest falling away from the faith, and an argument of arrogancy, either to reject any point of those things that are written, or to bring in any of those things that are not written."**[2] Jerome—"As we deny not those things that are written, so we refuse those things that are not written." **Such is the universal teaching of the Fathers.** This testimony confirms the 6th

[1] Origen, Hom. [2] Basil, De Fide.

Article of the Church of England: "Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation; so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man that it should be believed as an article of the faith." The Roman doctrine is an innovation: it is dishonouring to God's written Word, which everywhere proclaims its own sufficiency. Let the words of Jehovah be remembered, "*Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you, neither shall ye diminish ought from it*" (Deut. iv. 2, and Apoc. xxii. 18, 19, D.).

XV

THE SEVEN SACRAMENTS

Q.—Do not Romanists say that there are Seven Sacraments? On what grounds do Protestants recognise only two?

A.—It is quite true that the Church of Rome gives the name of sacrament to seven ordinances of religion. Thus it was decreed at the Council of Trent: "If any one saith the sacraments of the New Law were not all instituted by Jesus Christ our Lord, or that they are more or less than seven, to wit, baptism, confirmation, the eucharist, penance, extreme unction, orders, and matrimony; or even that any one of these seven is not truly and properly a sacrament; let him be anathema" (Sess. vii. can. 1). The definition of a sacrament given at the Council was, "A visible sign of invisible grace, instituted for our justification."

The meaning of the word "sacrament" has varied in different ages. Originally it meant a "*sign*"; then it became equivalent to the Greek "*musterion*"—any mystery of the faith—so that every revealed truth was called a sacrament, *e.g.* the incarnation,

resurrection, preaching, singing of the psalms, &c.[1] Gradually it was restricted to the two ordinances of Christ's own institution, Baptism and the Lord's Supper, and this was its general use till about the end of the fourth century. Sometimes Confirmation was mentioned as a sacrament, or part of the sacrament of Baptism, being regarded as its completion, specially in the case of baptized infants. The Homily of the Church of England on "Common Prayer and Sacraments" mentions these different uses, and follows the teaching of St. Augustine: "In a general acceptation the name of a sacrament may be attributed to anything whereby an *holy thing is signified;* in which understanding of the word the ancient writers have given this name, not only to the other five commonly, and of late years taken and used for supplying the number of the seven sacraments, but also to divers ceremonies, as to oil, washing of the feet, and such like, not meaning thereby to repute them as sacraments in the same signification that the two fore-named (Baptism and the Lord's Supper) sacraments are. And therefore St. Augustine, weighing the true signification and exact meaning of the word, in the third book of Christian Doctrine affirmeth that the sacraments of the Christians are 'most excellent in signification and most few in number' . . . making mention expressedly of two—Baptism and the Supper of the Lord." This restric-

[1] Smith's "Christian Antiquities," vol. ii. p. 1831.

tion is adopted by most Protestants, in accordance with the definition that a sacrament is "an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace, given unto us, ordained by Christ Himself"; whereas the other five held by Rome as sacraments "are not counted for sacraments of the Gospel, being such as have grown partly of the corrupt following of the apostles, partly are states of life allowed in the Scriptures, but yet have not like nature of sacraments with Baptism and the Lord's Supper, for that they have not any visible sign or ceremony ordained of God."[1]

The Protestant view is clearly the correct one. There is a peculiar dignity and distinctiveness about Baptism and the Lord's Supper, as the two and only ordinances of the Gospel which were instituted by Christ Himself—the one for the admission of disciples into His visible Church, the other as a perpetual bond of union with Him and with one another. They stand separate and alone, possessing a sanctity of their own, so recognised by the early Church and by every thoughtful reader of the New Testament. What Rome says of the other five is not correct. No single text can be quoted to prove that any one of them was "instituted by Jesus Christ," however necessary some of them may be for the welfare of the Church and her members. CONFIRMATION was practised by the Apostles after

[1] Art. xxv., Church of England.

our Lord's ascension (Acts viii. 14–17). MATRIMONY was instituted in the time of man's innocency, and has no more right to be treated as a sacrament of the Gospel than the observance of the Sabbath, which was equally a primitive institution. Our Blessed Lord solemnly sanctioned and defended the purity of marriage, but to sanction and purify what already exists is not to institute; and it is a serious charge against Rome that she so often offends against Christ's teaching by giving dispensations for divorce, or for marriage within the prohibited degrees, when it suits her purpose.[1] EXTREME UNCTION.—The unction of the sick mentioned by St. James (v. 14, 15) was recommended by him for the bodily healing of the sick, "*the prayer of faith shall heal the sick, and the Lord shall raise him up*"; whereas it is well known that practically Rome restricts its use to those who are pronounced beyond hope of recovery, The Church of the first three centuries did not practise the rite, regarding it as a miraculous power peculiar to the Apostles;[2] no claim, therefore, can be made for its permanent observance. Nor is there the least ground for its being reckoned as a sacrament in the Roman sense, for it is neither "necessary to salvation" nor "instituted by Jesus Christ our Lord." The "Ordering

[1] *E.g.* Duke of Aosta married his niece the Princess Marie, daughter of his sister the Princess Clotilde. Annual Reg. for 1888.

[2] See Mark vi. 13.

of Ministers" is doubtless derived from apostolic usage and authority, and is of great importance to the well-being of a Church, but there is no visible sign or mode of the appointment directly instituted by our Lord. As regards PENANCE, whatever fragments of truth it may contain, as a whole it can only be described as a most "corrupt" following of the Apostles.

[MATRIMONY.—Rome does not permit divorce,—it is forbidden. But she has a way out of the difficulty which can be attained by a decree of nullity—i.e., a decision that no marriage took place.

In 1905, the Duke of Marlborough married Miss C. Vanderbilt according to the rites of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the U.S.A.

In 1920 the Duchess divorced him, and married Col. Balsan a year after, and the Duke married again a little later. Both then became Roman Catholics and applied for the annulment of their marriage. In 1926 the Roman Catholic Courts declared it null and void. A more direct challenge to the basis of family life cannot be conceived.]

XVI

PENANCE

Q.—Yet Romanists attach immense importance to this so-called "sacrament" of Penance.[1] What is its precise nature?

A.—PENANCE is defined by the Church of Rome to be "a sacrament of the new law instituted by Christ for the remission of sins committed after baptism." In reality it is not a sacrament, even by Rome's definition, for it possesses no "visible sign," no outward "element." It is condemned as a sacrament by the well-known saying of St. Augustine: "The word is joined to the ELEMENT, and a sacrament is formed." Rome asserts that the contrition, confession, and satisfaction of the penitent form, "as it were," the "matter of the sacrament." But these constitute no "element," no "visible sign," nothing that can be applied "outwardly." They are dispositions of the mind or heart; and if repentance can thus be made a sacrament, faith and charity and hope might as readily and justly be termed sacraments. It is properly a rite or ordinance invented

[1] Penance is Rome's wrong translation of the original word which universally signifies Repentance in the New Testament, and means a *change of heart.*

by the Roman Church, an engine of immense power and influence to her priesthood. It needs to be thoroughly sifted and understood.

THE NATURE OF PENANCE.—The Council of Trent, Sess. xiv., declares that "priests have real power to remit and retain sins; that persons are bound by the law of God to confess before the priest each and every mortal sin committed after baptism (Romish manuals recommend also the confession of venial sins), so far as memory can recall them, and that the sacrament of penance is *absolutely necessary* for the forgiveness of post-baptismal sin."[1] The four parts of a penance are contrition, confession, satisfaction on the part of the penitent, and on the part of the priest, absolution. Let these be tested by Holy Scripture.

CONTRITION is well defined by the Council as "a sorrow of mind and a detestation for the sin committed, with a purpose of not sinning again." It is "united with the Divine mercy" and perfected by "charity," *i.e.* the love of God. A "broken and contrite heart" is of the very essence of true and deep repentance, and this undoubtedly has its place in CONTRITION as defined by the Council. But this is weakened and imperilled by adding that "attrition," or sorrow which proceeds chiefly from the fear of hell and punishment, may be accepted in place of contrition, provided it be crowned by the sacra-

[1] Catholic Dictionary.

ment of penance. Jeremy Taylor puts this error in a startling form. "As contrition without their ritual and sacramental confession will not reconcile us to God, so attrition (as they call it), or contrition imperfect, together with their sacrament, will reconcile the sinner. Contrition without it will not; attrition with it will reconcile us; and, therefore, by this doctrine, which is expressly decreed at Trent, there is no necessity of contrition at all, and attrition is as good to all intents and purposes of pardon, and a little repentance will prevail as well as the greatest, the imperfect as well as the perfect."[1] Surely such teaching, if it follows the apostles at all, follows most corruptly.

CONFESSION.—The confession required in penance is called auricular, because it is made *secretly* into the *ear* (Latin *auris*) of the *priest;* it is compulsory,[2] for it is taught that without it the forgiveness of God cannot be obtained, and the sinner abides under the anathema of the Roman Church; it is most searching—"All mortal sins must be laid open to the priest, even such as are buried in the darkest secrecy, together with all aggravating or extenuating circumstances." The confessors are *authorised to examine into the nature of sins*, and are assisted by a manual of questions drawn up by the canonised

[1] Taylor's "Dissuasions," pt. I. chap. ii.

[2] Confession begins at the age of seven. Every Romanist *must* confess at least once a year; a good Catholic confesses once a week or once a month, and certainly before every partaking of the Eucharist.

St. Alphonsus Liguori, and approved by the Pope. Many of these questions are so impure that it has been well said, "Happily for the morality of the masses, the book is disguised in a Latin dress";[1] but what must be its effect upon the priests, for they are men of like passions with their people? This is the confession which is declared to be NECESSARY TO SALVATION.

CONFESSION AS TAUGHT IN THE BIBLE.—The Bible teaches that confession of sin is a necessary part of repentance. Thus in Psalm xxxii. 5 it is written: "*I said, I will confess my transgressions unto the Lord: and Thou forgavest the iniquity of my sin.*" Psalm li. is chiefly the outpouring, the confession to God, of a bruised and contrite heart. Solomon (Prov. xxviii. 13, D.), warns us, "*He that hideth his sins shall not prosper: but he that shall confess and forsake them shall obtain mercy.*" So St. John in his first Epistle, chap. i. 7–9, D., reminds us that "*The blood of Jesus Christ His Son cleanseth us from all sin: if we confess our sins, He is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all iniquity.*" This confession on the part of the individual is to be sincere and particular (not cloaked in generalities), as David in his penitential psalm confessed his "*blood-guiltiness*" in the matter of Uriah, and St. Paul spoke of his having been a "*blasphemer and a persecutor of the Church of God and injurious.*" That God knows our

[1] Swete, England *v.* Rome, p. 182.

sins is no more an excuse for not confessing them by name than His knowledge of our wants takes away the necessity of particular and earnest prayer. But in all these cases, and in every other mentioned in the Bible, the confession is not to a man, not to a priest, not into the ear of a human confessor—it is always to GOD. The forgiveness is sought not through earthly agents, but direct from God in Christ, Who redeemed us with His precious blood. The instances quoted by Romanists—surely often with misgiving—are wide of the mark. Thus Mark (i. 5, D.), records that there went out to John the Baptist "*All the country of Judea and* ALL *they of Jerusalem*," and "*were baptized by him in the river of Jordan, confessing their sins.*" But how was "penance" possible for such multitudes? **It could only be a public and general acknowledgment of sin made openly, not secretly,** accepting by faith the remission of sins from God as preached by the Baptist, and not by secret priestly absolution. Such, too, could be the only course with regard to the Ephesians who came to St. Paul in such numbers, who "*believed and confessed and shewed their deeds*," and then burned their books "*before all men.*" The confession was public, not secret, in the presence of friends and foes, not in the ear of a priest, and their forgiveness came direct to them from Christ, in whom they believed. This is the Divine rule, the saint's privilege, the sinner's hope.

SATISFACTION.—There is a suspicious ring about this word "satisfaction," which expresses the third condition of absolution in penance. Scripture leads the serious minded who are acquainted with their own hearts to prefer the words "amendment" and "reparation." Without amendment the contrition and confession will be unreal. The true penitent will not suppose that secret confession to God relieves him of the necessity for confessing to his neighbour the wrong or injury which he has committed against him, together with all possible reparation. He will carry out St. James's rule, "*Confess your sins one to another, and pray for one another that you may be saved*" (James v. 16, D.),[1] on which Cardinal Cajetan fearlessly remarks that they enjoin only the mutual confession of Christians and admission of special faults, and not confession to a priest.

[1] Romanists are in such straits to find any Scriptural authority for this confession that they often adduce this passage in its behalf, on which the Homily on Repentance observes: "Whereas the adversaries go about to wrest this place, for to maintain their auricular confession withal, they are greatly deceived . . . for if this text ought to be understood of auricular confession, then the priests are as much bound to confess themselves to the lay people as the lay people are bound to confess themselves unto them; and if to pray is to absolve, then the laity by this place hath as great authority to absolve the priests as the priests have to absolve the laity." St. Augustine * evidently took the same view: "What have I to do with man that they should hear my confession, or think that they are able to heal all my diseases? Why do they seek to hear of me what I am, who will not hear of thee what they are?"

* Fourth century.

But SATISFACTION is used by Romanists to express not so much reparation towards man as *something offered to God by the penitent in satisfaction for sin.* Thus the Council of Trent defines it as "that compensation by which a man makes some reparation to God for the sins that he has committed." Their theological writings follow this direction:— Thus Bossuet, one of the ablest of Roman apologists, writes: "Catholics teach unanimously that only Jesus Christ was capable of offering to God sufficient satisfaction for our sins. But having satisfied superabundantly, He was able to apply this satisfaction in two ways—either by granting entire remission without letting any penalty remain, or, on the other hand, by commuting a greater into a lesser penalty, *i.e.* eternal into temporal punishment. The former he employs in baptism; but we believe that He employs the second way in the case of those who fall back into sin after baptism, being, as it were, constrained to do so by the ingratitude of those who have abused His first gift, so that they have to suffer punishment, although the eternal one is remitted. . . . He grants us pardon on the conditions, under the laws, and with the reserves which seem good to Him." But where is this distinction laid down by Christ? Would not any honest man in reading all our Lord's offers of forgiveness on the simple conditions of repentance and faith, again and again repeated to sinners, such as Zaccheus and the woman

who had been a sinner—would not such a man feel that he had been grievously deceived if afterwards told that these gracious words applied only to baptism; that Christ had certain "reserves" which He did not choose to express; that as regards the actual sins of daily life they only signified pardon as obtained through a priest, and that a pardon which was conditioned by secret confession, judicial examination, and some satisfaction, or penance, which the priest might impose, or punishment in purgatory? God may, and does frequently, allow the *natural consequences* of sin to continue in this life after sin is pardoned. Thus He deals with David and Moses and Israel. But these never dreamed that they were making satisfaction or "atonement"[1] to God by their sufferings; no idea of "merit" ever entered their minds, only regret and humble submission to the Divine will, and prayer that God's deserved chastisements might be "*for their profit*," so *that they might* be "*partakers of His holiness.*"[2] Satisfaction by *man to God* is utterly unknown to Holy Scripture, even as it was also to the Fathers. Satisfaction or reparation should be made to those whom we have injured, but satisfaction to God for sin can only be made by Christ, Who made on the Cross, "by His one oblation of Himself once offered, a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice,

[1] Used by Bagshawe, "Threshold," 108.
[2] Heb. xii. 10.

oblation, and SATISFACTION for the sins of the whole world."[1]

ABSOLUTION.—The teaching of Rome is, that when the dispositions and acts of contrition or attrition, confession and satisfaction, are afforded by the sinner, the priest has the power of forgiving the sins confessed. For 1200 years the form was that of a prayer, as in the Greek Church; but the Council of Trent (Sess. xiv. can. 9) defines it as "a *judicial* act, by which the priest as judge passes sentence on the penitent." So again the priest is compared to a magistrate "who possesses a jurisdiction over the penitent."[2] This is a very solemn and awful claim, for which clear and unmistakable evidence and authority ought to be produced. The only text is that in John xx. 21, where it is written that Jesus said to the disciples, "*As the Father hath sent Me, I also send you. When He had said this He breathed on them, and He said to them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost: whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven them, and whose you shall retain they are retained*" (Douay Ver.). These words are treated by Romanists (1) as if addressed to the apostles *only*, and (2) as if they gave the apostles the exclusive power of conferring upon others a similar exclusive power of ordination and of remitting or retaining the sins of individuals in auricular confession, or the so-

[1] Consecration Prayer in Holy Communion.
[2] Catholic Dictionary.

called sacrament of penance. But the passage does not bear this interpretation. The words were not spoken to the apostles *only*, but to others also. St. Luke, referring to the same occasion (Luke xxiv. 33, 35), mentions "the eleven, and THEY THAT WERE WITH THEM," so that, as Bishop Westcott remarks, **"The words were not addressed to all the apostles, nor to the apostles alone.** Thomas was absent, and there were others assembled with the apostles, as we learn from St. Luke. The commission and the promise were given, therefore, like the pentecostal blessings they prefigured, to the Christian society, and not to any special order in it—**to the Christian society, not to the Christian ministry.**" No one questions but that forgiveness of sins and consequent reconciliation with God is the aim of the Gospel and of the Gospel ministry. But how is this attained? In what *manner* is it announced and bestowed? Surely the commission contained in these words is immediately explained by our Lord Himself when He charged the disciples that "*repentance and remission of sins should be* PREACHED *in His name among all nations*" (Luke xxiv. 47). The disciples clearly so understood it from what is related in the last verse of St. Mark's Gospel, "*And they went forth and* PREACHED *everywhere, the Lord working with them and confirming the Word with signs following.*" Thus St. Paul also understood when he wrote, "*God hath given to us the ministry of reconciliation. We are*

ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us: we pray you in Christ's stead, be ye reconciled to God" (2 Cor. v. 18, 20). That message, like its Divine Teacher, is "*set for the rise*" or "*for the fall*" of many in the visible Israel—the Christian Church.

Wherever and by whomsoever the Gospel is preached, its message is to many "*a savour of life unto life*," and to not a few "*a savour of death unto death*"; some will receive it unto the REMISSION of sins, others to sin's RETENTION, for "*he that believeth not is condemned already.*" The recorded ministry of the apostles agrees with this interpretation, and this only. Nowhere do we trace the *secrecy*, the private confession, the judicial examination, the personal absolution, of the rite of penance. Everywhere the apostles adopt the first announcement of Jesus Christ as their text: "REPENT *and* BELIEVE *the Gospel*" (Mark i. 15, D.).[1]

FAITH, not penance, is everywhere proclaimed by them to be the instrument of grace. Let a few instances be meditated upon as examples of the universal apostolic teaching:[2]—"*But as many as received Him (Christ), He gave them power to be made the sons of God, to them that* BELIEVE *in His name*" (John i. 12). "*For you are all the children of God by* FAITH *in Christ Jesus*" (Gal. iii. 26). "*Whosoever*

[1] The above sufficiently refutes the Roman interpretation. For the further teaching of the text see Jewell's "Apology," S.P.C.K., pp. 24, 25.

[2] The quotations are from the Douay version.

BELIEVETH *that Jesus is the Christ is born of God*" (1 John v. 1). "*Abraham* BELIEVED *God, and it was reputed to him unto justice* (*righteousness*). *Now it is not written only for him, that it was reputed to him unto justice* (*righteousness*), *but for us also, to whom it shall be reputed, if we* BELIEVE *in Him, that raised up Jesus Christ our Lord from the dead*" (Rom. iv. 3, 23, 24, iii. 21, 22). "*Amen, Amen, I say unto you, he that heareth my word and* BELIEVETH *Him that sent* ME, *hath everlasting life, and cometh not into judgment, but is passed from death to life*" (John v. 24). "*For by grace are you saved through* FAITH, *and this not of yourselves, for it is the gift of God. Not of works, that no man may glory*" (Eph. ii. 8, 9). "*Whom* (*Christ*) *having not seen, you love: in Whom also now, though you see Him not, you* BELIEVE: *and* BELIEVING *shall rejoice with an unspeakable and glorified joy, receiving the end of your* FAITH, *even the* SALVATION *of your* SOULS" (1 Peter i. 8, 9, D.).

Such is the teaching of Holy Scripture on the subject of absolution. How different is the teaching of the Church of Rome! That Church is ever dwelling upon one or two texts which she thinks are capable of being distorted to her priestly interests, passing by the hundreds of passages which encourage the sinner to be truly penitent and to seek forgiveness at once from Christ, Who is ever waiting to be gracious, but gives not His Divine prerogatives to imperfect man.

A more dangerous system could not be invented than Rome's system of penance. It is dangerous to her priests, fostering pride and earthly love of power over the consciences of men; dangerous to society, as it gains the secrets of individuals, families, courts, and cabinets for the purposes of a priestly caste which has no family ties and owes a stronger allegiance to the Papacy than to the lawful sovereign; dangerous to the devout and tender-hearted, from whom it withholds a present and permanent peace with God; and dangerous—sometimes fatal—to the careless, who flatter themselves that by attrition, a little sorrow, and this human rite, they can obtain absolution at the last.

NOTE.—The origin of this strange compound of doctrines is somewhat obscure. Much is due to the mistranslation of the word *pœnitentia*, which Rome renders "penance," whereas its true meaning is "repentance." In the early Church there was an ecclesiastical discipline exercised towards apostates and notorious criminals with a view to their repentance and recovery, and this was technically called "confession," but it was made in sight of the whole Church, of laity and clergy. This public discipline is wilfully confounded in the Tridentine Catechism with the private confession which it calls "sacramental." But the necessity of private confession was denied by St. Chrysostom, and continued to be an open question up to the twelfth century. The fourth Lateran Council (1215) first declared it to be a compulsory institution.[1] Like other *developments* of the Roman Church, it is utterly alien from the primitive form and intention.

[1] See England *v.* Rome, 184–85.

XVII

THE EUCHARIST (TRANSUBSTANTIATION)

Q.—What are the chief points of difference between Romanists and Protestants in reference to the Lord's Supper or Eucharist?

A.—The points of difference are threefold and of great importance, since Rome's doctrine of the Eucharist may be regarded as the centre of her system. First, Romanists believe that when the priest uses the words of institution uttered by our Lord, the "substance" of the bread is changed into the "substance" of Christ's Body, and the substance of the "wine" into the substance of Christ's Blood, which change or conversion is called *Transubstantiation.* Secondly, they profess to offer up our Lord Jesus Christ, Who is thus supposed to be present on the altar, as a *propitiatory* sacrifice for the living on earth and for the souls in purgatory. Thirdly, they hold that Christ, by the words of institution, made His ministers to be *sacrificing priests,* similar to the Levitical priests of the former dispensation. Protestants reject these doctrines and their necessary consequences, believ-

ing them to have no foundation in the early faith of the Christian Church, and to be contrary to the universal teaching of God's Word as to the dignity and sufficiency of the ONE sacrifice and propitiation offered up "*once for all*" on Calvary.

TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

Q.—What are Rome's reasons for believing in transubstantiation, and why was the doctrine rejected at the Reformation?

Before entering into the reasons, it is necessary to state the doctrine in the language of Rome's authorised decrees. It was thus laid down at the Council of Trent (Sess. xiii. ch. 4): "By the consecration of the bread and wine a conversion is made of the whole substance of the bread into the substance of the body of Christ our Lord, and of the whole substance of the wine into the substance of His blood, which conversion is by the Holy Catholic Church suitably and properly called transubstantiation." To this should be added Art. v. of the Creed of Pius IV.: "In the most holy sacrament of the Eucharist there are truly, really, and *substantially* the body and blood, together with the soul and Divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ." This doctrine, as the English archbishops recently described it,[1] "depends upon the acceptance of a

[1] Reply to Cardinal Vaughan on Anglican Orders.

metaphysical definition expressed in terms of mediæval philosophy." The philosophy is that of Aristotle, who attempted to draw a distinction between "substance" and "accidents" — substance being the inner reality in which the qualities or accidents—the taste, smell, form, colour, &c.—inhere. Now from the existence and appearance of the accidents reason infers the nature of the substance to which they must necessarily correspond. Thus when Christ turned the water into wine, the master and the guests immediately knew from the taste, smell, colour, &c.—from the "accidents," as that philosophy would call them—that the miraculous change had taken place—that the water was converted into wine. But in this so-called transubstantiation, which is alleged to take place in the Eucharist, the "accidents," the shape, form, taste, colour, smell of the bread remain, giving no evidence of the mighty change which Rome expects her members to believe. From the supposed change in the substance it is further taught that[1] "*Christ is in the Eucharist really*, i.e. *objectively, so that His presence does not depend on the faith of the recipient: He is there substantially, which excludes the error*" (rather the truth, see Acts iii. 21, D.) "*that Christ's body was in heaven and nowhere else, though it exercises its virtue and power in the*

[1] The italics are the writer's, to make the Roman Catholic quotations clearer to the reader.

Eucharist." Moreover they affirm, "*Where Christ's body is, there His Godhead must be also, because by the hypostatic*[1] *union the Godhead became indissolubly united to His human nature.*"[2] And again: "*Christ has no body except that glorified one which is united to His blood, no blood except such as united to His body*": Therefore, "*there is whole Christ in the bread and in the wine.*" "*Each receives Christ not partly but wholly: the human nature of our Lord, united to his Divinity, is wholly and entirely in every place where the Sacrament is preserved,*"[3] and also "*in every* PART *of the species, in every particle of the bread and drop of the wine.*" And again: "*The words of consecration would of themselves put the body only under the form of bread, the blood only under that of wine, were it not for the fact of concomitance.*"[4] So it is taught that whilst Christ's human body is in heaven, it may be on *ten thousand altars at the same time.*[5] Add to all this that "*from the moment of consecration our Lord remains constantly under the appearance of bread and wine so long as the outward forms exist unchanged,*"[6] and "the *Blessed Sacrament in the species of bread*

[1] Hypostatic, *i.e.* the union of Christ's human nature to the "hypostasis" or Person of God the Word.

[2] Catholic Dictionary, 348.

[3] "Threshold," &c., pp. 118, 119.

[4] "Concomitance" expresses the Roman Catholic doctrine that Christ is present, whole and entire, under each species, the bread and the wine: it contradicts Christ's word of institution.

[5] Catholic Dictionary.

[6] "Threshold," &c., 122.

is reserved after Mass and placed in the tabernacle on the altar, that the faithful may come to the Church to adore Christ,"[1] or, as it is usually expressed, to adore It: and *wherever It may be present, Catholics pay It that supreme worship which is due to God alone.*" No wonder that the Catholic Dictionary, after mentioning these points of doctrine as necessary results of transubstantiation, should add—"*All this of course involves a series of* STUPENDOUS MIRACLES";[2] nor

[1] Council of Trent, Sess. xiii. 5.

[2] Nor are these the only "STUPENDOUS MIRACLES" involved in the doctrine of transubstantiation. Who can believe that in the upper room Christ carried His own "body, blood, soul, and divinity," that is to say, His entire Self, in His own hands? Yet Rome expects her members to believe this contradiction to all reason. Who can fix the time for the withdrawal of Christ's body, blood, soul, and divinity from the bread and wine, and their *re-transubstantiation* into their natural substances, which is implied by the Roman belief that they continue only "*so long as the outward forms exist unchanged*"? (Bagshawe, 122). Who can determine on such uncertain evidence when Christ has left "the tabernacle on the altar," without which knowledge the worshipper may become an involuntary idolator? What becomes of the Sacred Body when it enters the body of the communicant? How long does it remain there? Some of these questions arise from any doctrine of Christ's real localised presence in the elements and testify against it. As to the speculation of Romanist divines relative to what happens when the communicant is seized with nausea, or the priest suffers the consecrated wafer to fall or to be lost, or carried away by some dumb creature, they shall not be discussed here as too profane.[1] Suffice it to say, no doctrine can be of God which leads to such inevitable questionings in the mind of man.

[1] For the extraordinary shifts to which the mediævalists were driven in order to explain what really happens under such circumstances, see Witmund, "*De Corporis et Sanguinis Christi Veritate*," ii. § 7, *seq.*)

is it a matter of surprise that the chief editor, W. E. Addis, when the work was finished, left the Church of Rome, becoming a Unitarian! Such demands upon faith—contrary to reason, without evidence and without purpose—must lead to scepticism or credulity.

CONTRARY TO REASON.—Faith requires us to accept some revealed doctrines which are *above* reason, but never anything that is *contrary* to it. The doctrines of the Holy Trinity and of the Incarnation are *above* reason, not *contrary* to it. But to accept the doctrine of transubstantiation when the evidence of the *senses* (mark, not of "common-sense," which may be mistaken, but of the senses) contradicts any such change, is to deprive man of those very sources of evidence on which the resurrection of Jesus Christ alone depends, and thus to destroy faith in Christianity. Christ appealed to the "senses" in testimony of the reality and identity of His resurrection body. "*See My hands and My feet, that it is I Myself: feel and see:* for a *spirit hath not flesh and bones as you see Me have*": and again to Thomas, "*Put in thy finger hither, and see My hands, and bring hither thy hand and put it into My side: and be not incredulous but faithful*" (Luke xxiv. 39, and John xx. 27, D.). It is contrary to reason also that a body should be in more places than one at the same time. The risen body of the Lord had undoubtedly increased powers as a glorified body. He appeared and disappeared at will. Yet we never

read of His appearing in His human body in two places at the same time. With this dictate of reason all the allusions to our Lord's risen state strictly correspond. Thus St. Peter, speaking of our Lord (Acts iii. 21, D.), said, "*Whom heaven indeed must receive until the times of the restitution of all things.*" And this was the belief of the whole Church as expressed in the Apostles' Creed—"Who sitteth at the right hand of God the Father Almighty, from thence He shall come to judge the quick and the dead."

The miracle claimed by Rome is an invisible miracle, and reason requires that it should be proved by some visible attestation. When Christ said to the sick man "*Thy sins are forgiven thee,*" the Pharisees reasonably objected to the claim. It asserted Divine prerogatives which any one might assume, since, being an *invisible* miracle, who could disprove it? It was a claim which any impostor might set up. The Lord recognised the reasonableness of the objection and immediately gave the necessary proof and visible attestation: "*That you may know that the Son of Man hath power on earth to forgive sins, then saith He to the man sick of the palsy, Rise, take thy bed and go into thy house*" (Matt. ix. 6, D.). Reason, God's pre-eminent gift to man, demands some similar attestation to this invisible miracle of Rome; but there is none, the bread and the wine remain visibly and sensibly the same.

TRANSUBSTANTIATION IS WITHOUT PROOF FROM SCRIPTURE. — It will be said by the Romanist, "Surely the words of Christ are sufficient evidence." Protestants accept Christ's words explicitly. But the question is one of INTERPRETATION. All are agreed that Christ is really present in the administration of the sacrament, and that the believing communicant feeds upon the body and blood of Christ, but in each case "How"? Looking at the words of institution, let it be carefully noticed that our Lord did not simply say, "This is My body," but "This is My body *broken* (1 Cor. xi. 24) *given for you*" (Luke xxii. 19, R.V.), *i.e.* not the body glorified, but *sacrificed* and *slain*. So again our Lord did not say simply, "This is My blood," but "This is My blood *which is poured out for you*" (Luke xxii. 20, R.V.)—"the *new covenant in My blood*"—the sign and seal of the Gospel redemption through the DEATH of Christ. Thus both elements direct our thoughts to the new covenant of grace by "the sacrifice of the death of Christ," of which the sacrament was to be a perpetual remembrance.

Consider carefully how the words were understood by those who heard them. The apostles were Jews, and the words were uttered during the Passover feast, which was a feast upon a sacrifice. They had heard Jesus, as the Master of the feast, call the paschal lamb "the Passover," and taking the bread into His hands, He had said "This IS the bread of

affliction which our fathers did eat in Egypt." In neither case were the words literally true, but no one misunderstood them. They knew that the lamb of which they ate *represented* and *symbolised* the Passover lamb of Israel's deliverance, and the unleavened bread the suddenness of their flight and freedom. By parallel reasoning what could the Master mean when He called the bread and wine His body and blood, but that they represented and effectually symbolised the body so soon to be broken and the blood to be poured out? To a Jewish mind, forbidden to taste blood (Lev. iii. 17, vii. 26, D.), the words in their literal sense would have produced the utmost abhorrence, but the symbolical language throughout the Passover feast readily afforded them the true and natural interpretation. They could not fail to recognise in the *separated* elements the approaching death of their Blessed Lord which they were to commemorate for ever.

Such language was, moreover, a characteristic of our Lord's teaching, with which the disciples were well acquainted. He had spoken striking words to Nicodemus—"*Except a man be born anew he cannot see the kingdom of God.*" Nicodemus took them *literally*, and asked in wonder, if not in scorn, "*How can a man be born when he is old? Can he enter the second time into his mother's womb and be born?*" He had spoken to the woman of Samaria—"*Whosoever shall drink of the water that I shall give him shall never*

thirst." The woman took the words literally, and said to Him—"*Sir, give me this water, that I thirst not, neither come hither to draw.*" The same error is seen in John vi.—the chapter which records the turning-point in our Lord's ministry. It begins with the miracle of feeding the five thousand men beside the women and the children. Its grandeur impressed the multitude with the persuasion that Jesus was the Messiah, and they desired forcibly, there and then, to make Him king—an earthly, temporal monarch—who should use his powers to conquer Rome and in its place to establish an empire of their own (v. 15). The error thus taking positive form was intentionally crushed by the discourse which followed. Jesus emphatically taught them that His kingdom was not of this world—its warfare was spiritual, not carnal; its trophies penitent and believing souls; its agency the cross, not a throne—even the sacrifice of Himself in death: the whole summed up in language as terse and symbolical as that to Nicodemus: "*The bread which I will give is My flesh for the life of the world*"; and again, "*I say unto you, except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink His blood, ye have not life in yourselves.*"[1] Like the ruler and the woman, the disciples took Christ's words *literally* and were stumbled—"*How can this man give us His flesh to eat?*" and they "*walked no*

[1] John vi. 53, R.V.

more with Him."[1] The Lord endeavours to enlighten them by the interpretative words, "*It is the spirit that quickeneth: the flesh profiteth nothing: the words that I have spoken unto you are spirit and are life.*" "*What if ye should behold the Son of Man ascending where He was before?*" That visible ascension of His human body into the heavenlies ought to have banished for ever any thought of a carnal eating, or of material, substantial presence in the Eucharist. Those conversations with Nicodemus, with the Samaritan woman, and the disappointed spectators of the mighty miracle, should have preserved the Church from any *literal* acceptance of Christ's words at the sacramental institution and should have enforced the spiritual meaning. His approaching DEATH is the central thought of the ordinance, and the need of *our participation* in it for life, salvation, and holiness

[1] Cardinal Gibbons, in quoting the above passages, remarks that our Lord on other occasions "always took care to remove from their (His disciples') minds the wrong impression they had formed," and then asks, "But in the present instance, does our Lord alter His language when He finds His words taken in their literal sense? Does He soften the tone of His expressions?"—concluding triumphantly that He did not. The conclusion is as disingenuous as it is untrue; it is arrived at by *omitting* our Lord's explanatory words, "*It is the spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing,*" &c. Read 62, 63, which were added purposely because some were *stumbled*, v. 61. His book abounds in similar misrepresentations—it is plausible, but not honest. The Cardinal should weigh well the words of St. Augustine, "*Verba quæ ego locutus sum vobis spiritus et vita sunt.* Quid est, *spiritus et vita sunt?* Spiritualiter intelligenda sunt. Intellexisti spiritualiter? *Spiritus et vita sunt.* Intellexisti carnaliter? Etiam sic illa *spiritus et vita sunt*, sed tibi non sunt."—Aug. in Ioannis Evang., Tract xxvii. 5.

its spiritual teaching. This was the truth underlying His words, "*My flesh for the life of the world.*" Thus St. Paul understood them when he wrote to the Corinthians,[1] "*The* CUP *of blessing which we bless, is it not a* PARTICIPATION IN *the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not a* PARTICIPATION IN *the body of Christ?*" He does not say, "the cup is the blood of Christ," or "the bread is the body of Christ," but as the blood separated from the body signifies death, so the cup and the bread signify our "participation in the body and blood of Christ," *i.e.* in His DEATH, for "the remission of sins and all other benefits of His passion," to the great and endless comfort of those who rightly, worthily, and by faith receive the symbols and effectual signs of the Lord's sacrificial DEATH. It is thus that "the Body and Blood of Christ are verily and indeed taken and received by the Faithful."

TRANSUBSTANTIATION NOT HELD BY THE FATHERS. —The language of the Fathers upon both sacraments was frequently very strong and unguarded. There were no controversies in regard to them necessitating accuracy of definition, so that they preached and wrote in the glowing and emotional language of their first love, thinking no words too lofty wherewith to extol the consecrated signs and symbols of their great salvation by the blood of the cross. In reading their books the remark of St. Augustine has to be borne in mind, "that in the

[1] 1 Cor. x. 16, R.V. margin.

sacraments the *signs are called by the names of that which they signify.*" This is true of the sacraments of the Old Testament. Circumcision was called "the covenant," because it was the *sign* of the covenant which God made with Israel, and the sacrament which commemorated the deliverance from Egypt was called "the Passover," because it was the *sign* and remembrancer of that deliverance. So the Fathers and the Reformers often spoke of baptism as regeneration, because it was the *sign* of regeneration; and of the water in the font as the *blood* of Christ, because it *symbolised* His blood of cleansing. In like manner the Fathers (and the Reformers) called the bread and wine (the signs) by the names of that which they signified, *i.e.* the body and blood of Christ. Owing to this recognised usage, many expressions can be found in the Fathers, as also in the devotional language of Protestants, which seem at first sight to favour the idea that they believed in a certain change taking place in the elements. "They speak familiarly in terms which in strictness are proper only to the thing signified; so do modern writers,[1] when they write as the Fathers wrote,

[1] Take the following instance from Dr. Watts :—

"Jesus invites His saints
To meet around His board;
Here pardoned rebels sit and hold
Communion with their Lord.
For food He gives His flesh,
He bids us drink His blood:
Amazing favour! matchless grace,
Of our descending God!"

without thinking of controversy upon the subject, and without fear of being misinterpreted or misunderstood." But when they write carefully *as teachers*, they declare plainly their language was but figurative, and that they did not believe in any change in the bread and wine by consecration save that of use. Tertullian uses language which might seem to imply that he regarded the consecrated elements as literally the body and blood of Christ, but when he is exposing the error of Marcion, who denied the verity of our Lord's human nature, he appeals to the Eucharist, and writes, "When our Lord took the bread and distributed to the disciples, He made it His body, saying, 'This is My body,' that is, *a figure of My body* (*figura corporis mei*). But there could be no *figure* if there were not a true body of which it was the *figure*."[1] Thus St. Chrysostom,[2] arguing against the Eutychians, expresses himself with equal care: "The bread, before it is sanctified, we call bread. After the Divine grace has sanctified it, through the priest's instrumentality, we no longer call it bread. It is thenceforward dignified with the name of the Lord's body, though yet the nature of bread remains in it." St. Augustine has many passages in which he speaks freely of the sign as though it were the thing signified (in one place he even says of our Lord that he held His own body in His hands), but when occasion requires he distinguishes between them

[1] Book IV. ch. xl. [2] Fourth century.

with the greatest care. Thus in his book *De Doctrina Christiana*, iii. 24, he writes on the interpretation of Scripture: "If the words contain a precept, either forbidding what is flagitious or criminal, or enjoining what is useful and benevolent, we must understand them literally. But if the contrary they are a *figure*. Thus, when our Lord says, 'Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink His blood, ye have no life in you,' He seems to enjoin what is criminal or flagitious. *It is a figure*, bidding us communicate in our Lord's passion, and sweetly and profitably store up in our memories that for our sakes His flesh was crucified and pierced."[1] Other instances might be given to the same effect. The Fathers knew nothing of transubstantiation, or of any objective presence in the elements.

The doctrine is thus contrary to Scripture, reason, and the primitive Church. It overthrows the nature of a sacrament by professing to change the sign or figure into the thing signified. The very word was not known until the eleventh century, nor did the Roman Church receive it as doctrine until the Lateran Council, A.D. 1215.

[1] Quoted by Canon Heurtley on Doctrine of the Eucharist.

XVIII

THE SACRIFICE OF THE MASS

Q.—What special meaning do Romanists attach to the Mass or Eucharistic sacrifice?

A.—Few questions connected with Romish teaching can be more important, for on no doctrine is there a greater divergence between Romanists and Protestants than upon the doctrine of the Eucharistic sacrifice. With the refutation of transubstantiation Rome's doctrine of the sacrifice becomes impossible. If there is no real Objective Presence of Christ on the altar, the priest has no oblation to offer for propitiation: the controversy virtually ceases. But such is the importance of the subject that it may be well to try it on its own merits, and so to sift it as to remove all appearance of taking undue advantage of what has been already disproved. Only let the reader bear in mind that transubstantiation has been shown to be without support from Scripture, reason, or the authority of the early Church.

The difference between the Roman and the Protestant doctrines will be the more apparent by placing them side by side:—

ROMAN DOCTRINE.

"He, our God and Lord . . offered up to God the Father His own Body and Blood under the species of bread and wine; and under the symbols of those same things He delivered His own Body and Blood to be received by His Apostles, whom He then constituted priests of the New Testament; and by those words, 'Do this in commemoration of Me,' He commanded them and their successors in the priesthood to offer them: even as the Catholic Church has always understood and taught."—*Council of Trent*, Sess. xxii. ch. 1.

"If any man saith that in the Mass a true and proper sacrifice is not offered to God, that the sacrifice of the Mass is only a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, or that it is a bare commemoration of the sacrifice consummated on the cross, but not a propitiatory sacrifice: . . . or that it ought not to be offered for the living and the dead for sins, pains, satisfactions, and other necessities—that by the sacrifice of the Mass a blasphemy is cast upon the most holy sacrifice of Christ consummated on the cross—or that it is thereby derogated from, let him be anathema."—**Sess. xxii. Canon i. iii. iv.**

PROTESTANT DOCTRINE.

"The offering of Christ once made is that perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual; and there is none other satisfaction for sins but that alone. Wherefore the sacrifices of Masses, in the which it was commonly said that the priest did offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain or guilt, were blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits."—Art. xxxi., *Church of England.*

("Almighty God gave His) only Son Jesus Christ to suffer death upon the cross for our redemption: who made there (by His one oblation of Himself once offered) a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world: and did institute and in His holy Gospel command us to continue a perpetual memory of that His precious death, until His coming again."—*Prayer of Consecration.*

The reader can disregard the assertions and anathemas of the Church of Rome. Would that she would follow the Divine word according to her own Douay translation (Isa. viii. 20), "*To the law rather, and to the testimony. And if they speak not according to this word, they shall not have the morning light.*" This must be the test of all true doctrine.

The Roman doctors in their defence and exposition of the Mass sacrifice set themselves to treat it at considerable length. They could not but be aware that it far exceeded the language of the institution, and that it was evidently in marked contrast with the general argument of the Epistle to the Hebrews. First they lay down their own definition of sacrifice, and endeavour to show that it is compatible with the words of Christ. Then (2) they assert that our Lord in heaven,[1] and their priests in the Mass[2] at every altar, are offering up the same *propitiatory* sacrifice which Christ offered upon the cross; and (3) that the masses they offer are offered for the sins, pains, and satisfactions of those who

[1] For differences of Roman teaching on this point see Dimock's *Sacerdotium*, pp. 45, 46.

[2] The word "*mass*" is derived from Latin *mittere*, to send, dismiss, set free from further attendance. It was applied to the dismissal, first, of the catechumens after the Gospel and sermon, and next of the faithful at the end of the service. By degrees it was appropriated to the Lord's Supper; and at last became so associated with the Roman doctrine of a *propitiatory* sacrifice in the Eucharist that its use was wisely discarded by Protestants at the Reformation.

are alive, and for the souls detained in purgatory. Attention must be paid to these three points.

THE ROMAN DEFINITION OF SACRIFICE.—Rome defines sacrifice as "an act of external worship in which God is honoured as the principle and end of man and all things, by the oblation of a *visible* creature, by submitting it to an appropriate transformation by a duly qualified minister (Cath. Dic., p. 813). A somewhat different definition is given in the same book at p. 348. A sacrifice is "the oblation of a *sensible* thing to God through a lawful minister by a real change in the thing offered, to testify God's absolute authority over us and our entire dependence on Him." The definition is not that of the propitiatory sacrifices mentioned in the Bible; it is one of Rome's own making to suit her own purposes. The idea of a *transformation* or *change in the thing offered* is unknown to Scripture. But even so, it does not help the doctrine which it is intended to uphold. The same writers make the following comments upon the eucharistic sacrifice (marked with italics): "*All that is included in the idea of sacrifice is found in the Eucharist. There is the oblation of a sensible thing, viz. of the body and blood of Christ under the appearance of bread and wine.*" But one definition required a "visible" thing and the other a "sensible" thing, whereas the offering of *Christ* is neither *visible* nor *sensible;* the accidents, according to Rome, are not Christ, nor

are they His body and blood. "*There is a mystical destruction of Christ the victim, for Christ presents Himself on the altar as in a state of death, through the mystical separation between His body and blood.*" But "Christ being raised from the dead dieth no more," so that there can be no mystical destruction; or if one *part* is mystical, why not the *whole?* Why should not the change of bread and wine be mystical? The only possible representation of Christ's death is done away with by the Roman doctrine that "whole Christ, body and blood," are under *each* species, for by this it follows that the body and blood are never separated. "*In this sacrifice of thanksgiving we offer God the most excellent gift He has bestowed upon us, viz. the 'Son in whom He is well pleased'*"—words which draw forth the exclamation, "Awful presumption! Is not the Son *always* with the Father? Did not Christ say, '*I ascend* to my Father'? and does not the Eucharist represent God's highest *gift to fallen man* in the body broken and the blood shed of His incarnate Son?" "*God so loved the world that* HE GAVE *His only-begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on Him should not perish, but have eternal life.*" We may *receive* the Son, we may *feed* upon Him, "after a heavenly and spiritual manner," in our heart, by faith, but to think of offering the Son to God—approaches blasphemy! To speak of MAN'S offering God *to* God—God the Son to God the Father—is

more than is reverent. Christ said, "*I lay down My life of Myself: no man taketh it from Me*"; yet here is a claim to do what Christ expressly reserved to Himself—to His own power, time, and will. For it is important to notice accurately the

NATURE OF ROME'S EUCHARISTIC SACRIFICE.—This is always said to be "*one with that of the cross: on the cross and altar we have the same victim and the same priest.*"[1] Certain Roman theologians teach that Christ is now offering *in heaven* the *same* sacrifice which He offered upon Calvary. But this is plainly contrary to Scripture. In the Epistle to the Hebrews Christ's sacrificial work of propitiation is always spoken of and described as finished and complete; thus (i. 3), "*When He had made purification of sins, (He) sat down on the right hand of the majesty on high.*" So (x. 11, 14), "*And every priest indeed standeth day by day ministering and offering oftentimes the same sacrifices, the which can never take away sins: but He (Christ), when He had offered* ONE *sacrifice for sins for* EVER, *sat down on the right hand of God; for by* ONE *offering He hath perfected for* EVER *them that are sanctified.*" Here the *completeness* of Christ's sacrifice on the cross is fully declared, and its superiority over the Levitical sacrifices enforced on the very ground that it requires NO repetition as those did, and as the Romish priests presume to offer, whilst the very attitude, "*sat down*," expresses

[1] Catholic Dictionary.

that the high priest, Christ Jesus, had finished His work of propitiation. The same truth is involved in the Apostle's teaching that at the resurrection Christ was made "*a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek* (Heb. v. 6, R.V.). Jesus Christ is a priest still, but He is a king-priest, not serving at an altar, but seated on a throne—King of kings, King of peace, and King of righteousness. Christ is like Melchizedek, a priest in benediction, but not in propitiation, representing a non-Jewish, universal priesthood.[1] To attribute a sacrificial meaning to the bread and wine which Melchizedek brought to Abraham for his refreshment after the exhaustion of the battle, is simply to play upon words. Had there been any sacrificial import in them, the Epistle to the Hebrews, the New Testament book on sacrifices, could not possibly have passed it by. It has been well said, "The modern conception of Christ pleading in heaven His passion, 'offering His blood' on behalf of man, has no foundation in this Epistle (Hebrews). His glorified humanity is the eternal pledge of the absolute efficacy of His accomplished work. He pleads, as old writers truly expressed the thought, by *His presence on the Father's throne.*"[2] And this is the teaching of the Apocalypse. In not one passage is He represented as serving at an altar, or offering a sacrifice; He is ever king *upon a throne.*[3]

[1] Westcott *in loco.* [2] Bishop Westcott on Hebrews, p. 230.
[3] Apoc. iii. 21, v. 6, 7, vi. 16, 17, &c.

Many Roman writers insist that though Christ is not offering His propitiatory sacrifice personally in heaven, yet He is doing so on earth by the hands of His priests on every altar—"*On the Cross and altar we have the same Victim and the same Priest, i.e. Christ sacrificing by His priests.*" But how can "the same Victim" be offered daily on a thousand altars? Some Romanists say that the sacrifice of the cross is "*repeated*"[1] at every Mass. The greater number feel that this would incur the censure of the Epistle to the Hebrews, "*often offering the same sacrifices which can never take away sins,*"[2] and prefer to speak of the mass sacrifice as a "continuance" or "renewal" of that one sacrifice offered upon the cross. Others again, as the English Jesuits express it in their paper the *Univers*, "*The sacrifice of the cross and the sacrifice of the mass are not distinct, but are one and the same sacrifice, the Victim the same, the Chief Priest the same, and the objects the same.*" But the words "the sacrifice of the cross and the sacrifice of the mass *are one and the same*" present an unthinkable proposition—they are an abuse of language. "As the payment of a ransom price once paid is simply paid, and just because simply paid could not be more perfectly paid if the payment were repeated a thousand times, so the *once* offering of the one sacrifice has perfected and finished the

[1] See authorities in Dimock's "Sacerdotium," p. 60.

[2] Heb. x. 11, D.

work of sacrificing for ever."[1] Scripture declares not only that there is no more "*sacrifice for sin*," but there is no more "*offering*"[2]—no room for the *act* as well as no need for the thing, the sacrifice. The idea of *identity* is an impossible one, and only betrays the straits to which the Jesuits are driven. In truth, there is no one passage in Scripture which can be found to attach the idea of a "propitiatory" sacrifice to the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. Go back to the upper room where the feast was instituted: "It was no place for sacrifice. It had no altar of sacrifice. The reclining posture of those joining in the meal was no posture for sacrifice. The Lord offered no words of sacrifice other than the blessings and thanksgivings which the president of the feast was accustomed to offer as spiritual sacrifices."[3] Follow the history of the Church. In the Acts the Lord's Supper is almost uniformly alluded to as the "breaking of bread" (Acts ii. 46, xx. 7, D.): "*On the first day of the week, when we assembled to break bread.*" How striking the contrast between these early Christian meetings to commemorate the death of Christ and to strengthen their union with their ascended Lord and with one another by the sacramental signs of His precious Body and Blood, and the magnificent altar and cere-

[1] Dimock's "Sacerdotium," p. 57
[2] Heb. x. 18, R.V.
[3] Morris' "Growth of Sacrificial Ideas."

monial which have transformed the sacrament into a pageant and a sacrifice.

A few passages are indeed pressed into the service of this doctrine—a doctrine which, if true, would necessarily have been as fully revealed and proclaimed as the cross itself. There is St. Paul's argument (1 Cor. x. 21), in which it is attempted to show that there is an analogy between the table of the Lord's Supper and the altar of devils. But the analogy is not between two sacrificial rites, but between two religious acts of *obligation*. St. Paul might have used the sacrament of baptism with equal force; it would have illustrated the idea of *obligation* as clearly as the Lord's Supper, only the latter was more present to his mind and to the minds of his readers. Participation in either bound the partaker to the creed with which it was connected. The heathen was bound by his altar-worship to the doctrine of demons; the Christian by "the Lord's Table" was bound to the Lord Jesus Christ, so that it was impossible for him to be a "*partaker of the table of the Lord and of the table of devils.*" The expression in Heb. xiii. 10, "*We have an altar,*" is also quoted as referring to the Lord's Supper, but the context clearly shows that the writer is referring to our Lord's sacrifice on Calvary, and that the altar is the cross. So Malachi's (i. 11) prophecy is frequently appealed to. The words are: "*From the rising of the sun, even unto the going down*

of the same, My name shall be great among the Gentiles: and in every place incense shall be offered unto My name, and a pure offering (Minchah, meal-offering, R.V.), *for My name shall be great among the heathen, saith the Lord of Hosts.*" In the ancient Chaldee Targum of Jonathan the passage is thus paraphrased (second century): "Since from the rising of the sun and to its setting great is My name among the peoples, and in every time when you do My will, I will receive your prayer, and My great name will be sanctified by means of you, and your *prayer shall be as a* pure oblation before Me, since great is My name among the peoples, saith the Lord of Hosts." The Romanists argue that by the "pure offering" is to be understood the Roman mass; but that is impossible, whatever may be thought of its application to the Lord's Supper. The Minchah "*meal*-offering" had nothing of the *nature of expiation* connected with it, whereas Rome claims that the mass is a *propitiatory sacrifice*. It was an unbloody offering. Early writers frequently applied the passage to the spiritual sacrifices consequent on the Lord's Supper, as in the Chaldee paraphrase—*e.g.* to the sacrifices of prayer, praise, thanksgiving, and the recognition of God's gifts in the fruits of the earth, but *never* to any thought of expiation.

PROPITIATORY SACRIFICE IN THE EUCHARIST UNKNOWN TO THE FATHERS.—It may be confidently

said that the idea of the sacrifice of the cross being offered to God at the Eucharist is as foreign to the Fathers as the doctrine of Transubstantiation. Doubtless they often used the word "sacrifice" in relation to it, and the Romanist can produce a host of instances in which the word is so employed. But Rome has put a construction upon the language of the early Church which that language was never meant to bear, and against which the Fathers, when they apprehended the risk of misconstruction, were careful to guard. The reader of such quotations must (1) remember that the early Christians, whether converted from Judaism or heathenism, were accustomed to speak of every act, service, praise, alms, offering, to God or to His worship, as a sacrifice. He must not be misled by the *word*, but mark the context to see *what sort* of sacrifice is intended. St. Peter reminds all believers that they are a "*holy priesthood to offer up spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God.*" And what are these spiritual sacrifices? They are described as consisting of *praise* (Heb. xiii. 15), *faith* (Phil. ii. 17), *almsgiving* (Phil. iv. 18), *devotion of the body* (Rom. xii. 1), *conversion of unbelievers* (Rom. xv. 16), and similar actions of piety. Among these *sacrifices of the new dispensation* it is to be noticed that the Eucharist is not named as such.

In those early days every member brought some contribution to the weekly assembly (1 Cor. xvi. 2),

from which a selection was made for sacramental and other uses. These contributions were also called "offerings" or "sacrifices."[1] A singular expression was made use of by early writers to designate these spiritual sacrifices; they were called "bloodless" and "reasonable" to distinguish them from the sacrifices of Jews and heathen, and from that of our Blessed Lord. These "bloodless" sacrifices are again interpreted of the "troubled spirit," the "contrite heart," the "praises and vows" due to God. Tertullian, the first Latin Father so called, refers to the prophecy in Malachi, and explains the "pure offering" to be "hearty prayer from a pure heart," and, in another place, "giving glory and blessing, and praise, and hymns."[2] By degrees the sacrament is called a *commemoration* of the sacrifice of Christ, or a *representation* of the sacrifice of Christ.

St. Chrysostom and St. Augustine use sacrificial language, but again they explain themselves: "We perform a *memorial* of sacrifice."

About this time a great change came over the Christian Church, whereby its simplicity and spirituality were greatly marred. Constantine the Great had become nominally a Christian, and with him the Roman State. The heathen temples were handed over to the clergy in all their splendour, and the

[1] These are still called "oblations" in the consecration prayer of the Church of England.

[2] Contra Marcion, iv. 1, iii. 22.

temptation to hold services of corresponding grandeur led to the introduction of a sacerdotal ceremonial in Christian worship. This specially applied to the Eucharist, regarded as the central point in Christian services. A worldly adoption of titles and offices gathered from heathenism soon characterised many of the clergy. The Bishop of Rome became the "Pontifex Maximus" and the clergy sacrificing priests. The memorial of the Lord's Passion was at last assumed by Gregory the Great (A.D. 600) to be a real propitiatory sacrifice, in language unknown to the Church before his day. The teaching of Scripture and the early Fathers was gradually superseded by a resemblance to the present Roman form. But it can be confidently affirmed that in the beginning it was not so.

XIX

A SACRIFICIAL PRIESTHOOD

Q.—Is there no Sacrificing Priesthood in the present dispensation?

A.—If by a Sacrificing Priesthood is meant an order of ministers who can offer sacrifices of propitiation and expiation for sin, the scriptural answer is, Certainly not. Both priests and victims of propitiation terminated in Christ, at once the "High Priest" and "*the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world.*" The Levitical temple priests and sacrifices were types and "*figures for the time then present*" of our Lord Jesus Christ. The Jews had but *one* altar, which typified the cross: no other altar was allowed amongst the Jews, and they ought not to exist among Christians. **St. Peter, who should be an authority with Romanists, speaks of all those who "have tasted that the Lord is gracious," i.e. all true Christians, as "built up a spiritual house, a holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ." And again he calls these believers in Christ "a royal priesthood"** (1 Pet. ii. 5 and 9, D.). **Here the "holy priesthood" is not an**

order of ministers, but the whole body of Christians, and the sacrifices are spiritual sacrifices offered by all, plainly signifying the prayers and praises, the righteousness and holiness, of the new life.

A Sacrificing Priesthood is as unscriptural and unprimitive as the doctrines of transubstantiation and the mass, with which it is inseparably connected. **Not a passage can be produced from the New Testament where a minister of Christ is called a (hiereus) sacrificing priest.** Our Lord called them apostles (sent forth, missionaries) and disciples (learners). St. Paul describes the ministerial officers of the Church as "apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors, teachers, heralds, ambassadors, preachers," appointed by the ascended Lord and Head of the Church for the definite purpose of "*the perfecting of the saints, the work of the ministry, the edifying of the body of Christ.*"[1] He writes three pastoral epistles full of instruction to the local officers of the Churches—the bishops, presbyters, and deacons, but in none of these does he mention the *hiereus*, the sacrificing priest; nor does he in his charge to the Ephesian elders at Miletus. As Bishop Lightfoot remarks, "The Apostle discusses at length the requirements, the responsibilities, the sanctions of the ministerial office. . . . How then are the sacerdotal functions the sacerdotal privileges of the office, wholly set aside? If these claims were recognised by him at

[1] Eph. iv. 11, 12.

all, they must necessarily have taken a foremost place."[1]

St. Peter is equally ignorant of the office, and speaks of himself simply, "*who am also a fellow-elder*," (*sunpresbuteros*) (1 Peter v. 1, R.V.), unconscious of being a *hiereus*, much less of being a Pontifex Maximus and Vicar of Christ, as the Popes now call themselves. Romanists indeed assert that Christ made His apostles sacrificing priests when He said "Do this in remembrance of ME," treating the word "do" as if it meant "offer" or "sacrifice this." But the Greek word *poieite* never signifies to offer or to sacrifice, unless a sacrifice or sacrificial act is expressly assigned to it in the immediate context—the natural meaning is "do" or "observe this." This has been abundantly proved,[2] and is acknowledged by some Roman writers.[3] The title *hiereus* was assumed at first from a mistaken desire to make the Christian ministry correspond to the Levitical, and from what was equally a mistake, the supposition that the heathen would thereby be the more easily conciliated to the Christian faith. It is even probable that the title "priest" (*hiereus*, or Latin *sacerdos*) was originally adopted in the broad sense in which it has been shown that "sacrifice" was first used. However this may be, it followed the same

[1] On the Epistle to Philippians, p. 243, 2nd edition.
[2] See Abbott's Correspondence, with Supplement.
[3] *e.g.* Estius.

disastrous course, and was at last employed almost exclusively to express the doctrine that the priest offered a propitiatory sacrifice in the Eucharist for the sins of the living and the dead.

Disastrous Course.—The word is used advisedly. The Lord's Supper was instituted to sustain the soul's love to Christ the Saviour, to be a bond of union with Him as the Head of the Church, and a bond of union amongst all the baptized members of His body, as St. Paul taught, "*We who are many are one loaf, one body; for we all partake of the one* bread."[1] But the perversions of Rome have slaughtered thousands upon the battlefield and brought thousands to the stake. It seems too awful, yet it is wise to contemplate the reality, the fact, that an archbishop and bishops, laymen and women, "humble men and women of God," were burned at the stake in Christian England for their courage in denying the falsehoods of transubstantiation and of the presence of Christ—"truly, really, and substantially His body and blood, together with His soul and Divinity" in the consecrated wafer. This could not be the doctrine of the loving Saviour: it is a development of corruption, not of truth. No truth of His could produce such bitter fruit. Now as then He would say, "*Ye know not what spirit ye are of.*" "*The words that I speak unto you they are spirit and they are life*" (John vi. 63).

[1] 1 Cor. x. 17, R.V.

XX

THE TRUE DOCTRINE OF THE EUCHARIST

Q.—What is the true doctrine of the Eucharist usually held by Protestants?

A.—This question really involves three subjects, which have to be separately considered—the doctrines of priesthood, propitiatory sacrifice, and the Eucharist, or the Lord's Supper, according to the teaching of the New Testament. Rome's developments of error have been traced and examined; it remains that the simplicity and antiquity of truth should be set forth according to the teaching of Holy Scripture.

(1.) As regards PRIESTHOOD. — The doctrine of priesthood may be thus summarised in the language of Holy Writ:[1] "*We* HAVE *a great High Priest, Jesus the Son of God, Who having obtained eternal redemption for us, is set down on the throne of the majesty on high.*" "For He *has entered into heaven itself now to appear before the face of God for us,* NOT *to offer Himself often,* having *been* ONCE *offered to bear the sins* of the human

[1] The quotations from the Bible are in italics, most of them from the Epistle to the Hebrews.

race." His priesthood is "*after the order of Melchizedec.*" It is a priesthood of Blessing, for He *is exalted to be a Prince and a Saviour*, to give *repentance and remission of sins* to all who seek Him. And His love is such that He needs no *persuasion* from saint or angel or Virgin Mother to grant an answer to our requests. He has bidden us to have *confidence, yea* "*boldness,*" to *enter into the holy place* by *the merit of His blood*, and to "*draw near with a true heart* in *full assurance of faith.*" It is a priesthood of Intercession, the presence of His glorified humanity being an ever-prevailing plea on behalf of sinners. A priesthood of *unchanged* Sympathy and Tenderness, for "*We have not a High Priest who cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities, but One that hath been in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin*"; so that we can "*therefore draw near with boldness unto the throne of grace, that we may receive mercy and find grace to help us in time of need.*" A priesthood of Kingly power, "*Head over all things to His Church*"—a priest "*upon a throne,*" bestowing *gifts upon men, even upon the rebellious*—ready, according to His wisdom, to strengthen the tried as He strengthened St. Stephen, to restrain those who, like Saul, in persecuting His servants persecute their Lord Himself—a priesthood as unlimited and unbounded as that of Melchizedec, about whose age, parentage, and nationality Scripture is silent, to the intent that he might typify the eternal character of that priest-

hood of Christ, Who will not be limited in His work of love and mercy and reconciliation by any man-made restrictions of ordinances and Churches, but Who will minister by His Holy Spirit to every broken and contrite heart—Who can "*bear gently with the ignorant and erring*" (R.V.), Who *heareth the cry of the poor destitute when they call* upon Him, Who is "*no respecter of persons*," *high and low, rich and poor*, being equal in His sight; wealth cannot hasten, nor poverty debar, the action of His love.

(2.) PROPITIATORY SACRIFICE.—It is an old charge against Protestants that they have no sacrifice for sins, and the charge has an old answer. From Rome's point of view, Pope Pius V. said the truth when he said that we have no sacrifice, because at the Reformation we abolished the sacrifice of the Mass. But the old answer of Bishop Jewel is as true as ever: "Indeed the mass is abolished through the gracious working of God. . . . They did tell us that in their mass they were able to offer Christ, the Son of God, unto God His Father for our sins. Oh, blasphemous speech, and most injurious to the glorious work of our redemption! Such kind of sacrifice we have not. CHRIST HIMSELF IS OUR HIGH PRIEST . . . by whom we are sanctified, even BY THE OFFERING OF CHRIST ONCE MADE, who took away our sins, and fastened them upon the Cross. . . . This is our sacrifice, this is our propitiation, this is the propitiation and sacrifice for the whole

world. How, then, saith Pope Pius we have no sacrifice?" This teaching of the saintly Bishop is but the direct teaching of the inspired writer of the Hebrews. Thus, after declaring that it is *impossible that the blood of bulls and goats should take away sins*, he states that Jesus Christ came to do God's will, "*by which will we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ* ONCE FOR ALL." And again, "*Every priest indeed standeth day by day ministering and offering oftentimes the same sacrifices, the which can never take away sins. But He (Christ) when He had offered* ONE *sacrifice for sins for ever* SAT *down on the right hand of God; . . . for by* ONE *offering He hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified;*"[1] to which he further adds, "*Where remission of these (sins) is, there is* NO MORE OFFERING *for sin.*" Not only is there no other SACRIFICE, but there is no *more offering* of the ONE sacrifice. And how can there be, if with reverence and faith we regard the profound and solemn words of the Redeemer in His act of dying,—"IT IS FINISHED"? Rome reads those words of our High Priest as if He had said, "It is beginning or It has begun—that sacrifice which has to be continued or renewed or repeated through the ages." Protestants dare not, and will not, so trifle with the words of the expiring Christ. They recognise the dignity of the Victim laying down His life on the altar of the Cross, even the

[1] Heb. x. 4, 10, 12, 14.

Incarnate Son of God. His work of sacrifice was the exhibition of God's righteousness and of God's love, "*in that God sent His only-begotten Son into the world . . .* to be *the propitiation for our sins . . . that we might live through Him.*" To charge such work with imperfection is to limit either the love or the power of God—the efficiency or sufficiency of the Divine Sacrifice. Every mass-sacrifice dishonours this work of "*God in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself* by *the blood of the Cross.*" The Church of England is well known for her charity and self-restraint. Rome has anathemas for any trifling difference from her additions to the Catholic Creeds. The Church of England has but *one*, arising from her loyalty to Christ, condemning those who presume to say that they can be saved without Christ.[1] This loyalty to Christ has constrained her to speak, not in bitterness, but in sadness, of these sacrifices of masses[2] as "blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits.[3] *Fables* they are, for they have no foundation in the Word of God nor in the primitive Church, and *blasphemous* they must be, inasmuch as they impugn the merit and sufficiency "of the one oblation of Christ finished upon the Cross." Love and loyalty to Christ

[1] Article XVIII. : "Of obtaining eternal salvation only by the name of Christ."

[2] "Masses" in the plural is the very word frequently used at the Council of Trent to denote the Roman doctrine. (See Dimock's "Dangerous Deceits," pp. 10, 11.)

[3] Article XXXI. : "Of the one oblation of Christ finished upon the Cross."

compel this honesty of speech—yea, love to Romanists themselves, if by any means they may be led to reconsider these errors, which they may have scarcely realised, owing to their familiarity with mass sacrifices from their infancy and to their scanty knowledge of the Word of God which has been imparted to them by their Church.

(3.) THE EUCHARIST.—After reading the record of its institution by our blessed Lord, with His twice-repeated direction, "*Do this in remembrance of Me*," our first thought is that it was "ordained for the continual remembrance of the sacrifice of the death of Christ and of the benefits which we receive thereby."[1] The deliverance from Egypt, hitherto commemorated by the Passover, was to be superseded by a greater deliverance from sin and death. It was fitting that this should be kept in perpetual remembrance "until His coming again," and to this end the Lord's Supper was ordained by Christ Himself. In this aspect the Eucharist may be fitly called a *commemorative sacrifice, i.e.* a feast of commemoration of the true and only sacrifice of Christ. The broken bread and the poured out wine vividly set before us the body broken and the life-blood shed from the sacred person of our Lord upon the cross for us men and for our salvation. Then, clustered round this central act of commemoration are all those *spiritual* offerings which Malachi fore-

[1] Church Catechism.

told,[1] and which St. Peter enjoins as the "*spiritual* sacrifices" of the universal Christian priesthood—those acts and gifts and qualities which the early Church regarded as the necessary accompaniments of our Lord's divine command—alms, praises, thanksgivings, the dedication of our souls and bodies to Christ's service, with the qualifications of faith, humility, and love.

Ancient Catholic writers with one voice deny the existence in the Christian Church of any but spiritual and commemorative sacrifices. "Why is it," asks the heathen objector in Minucius Felix (and Romanists seem to ask the same question), "Why is it that you Christians have no altars?" "The sacrifice which God accepts," is the reply, "is a good spirit and a pure mind and a guileless conscience. These are our sacrifices, these our offerings to God."[2]

And yet this Supper of the Lord is no vain ceremony, "no bare sign, no untrue figure of a thing absent."[3] Christ is truly present in the ordinance, not as *in* the elements, but associated with them to faith's believing use and apprehension. As the judicious Hooker expresses it, "Is there anything more expedite, clear, and easy than that, as Christ is termed our Life, because through Him we obtain life, so the parts of the sacrament are His body

[1] See p. 149.

[2] Quoted in "England *v.* Rome," p. 172.

[3] Homily "Of the worthy receiving and reverent esteeming of the sacrament."

and blood, for that they are so to us, who *receiving them, receive that by them* which they are termed? The bread and cup are His body and blood, *because they are causes instrumental,* upon the receipt whereof the participation of His body and blood ensueth. . . . The real presence of Christ's most blessed body and blood is not therefore to be sought for in the sacrament (in the consecrated elements), but *in the worthy receiver of the sacrament.*"[1] Thus to each faithful communicant the present Lord gives His body and blood after a heavenly and spiritual manner for faith to feed upon for the strengthening and refreshing of the soul, for closer union with Himself, for the remission of sin, and all other benefits of His passion.

It has been truly said that "Rome knows no perfect remission of sin, and the mass-sacrifice can only live in a theology which knows not the true doctrine of justification by faith—the full justification of those who are justified freely by the grace of God through the redemption which is in Christ Jesus;[2] she fails to understand and to *believe* the promise of the Holy Ghost, "*Their sins and iniquities will I remember no more,*" followed by the declaration of the apostle, "*Now where remission of these* (sins and iniquities) *is, there is* NO MORE *offering for sin*" (Heb. x. 15–18).

[1] Eccl. Polity, Book V. lxvii. 5, 6.
[2] Dimock, "The Romish Mass."

XXI

COMMUNION IN ONE KIND

Q.—On what grounds do the Romanists prohibit the use of the Wine to the laity in the Eucharist, when the words of our Lord are so clear and emphatic, "Drink ye ALL of this"?

A.—The Council of Trent pronounces two anathemas in connection with this doctrine. One may suffice. "If any one saith that the Holy Catholic Church was not induced by just causes and reasons to communicate under the species of bread only laymen, and also clerics when not consecrating, let him be anathema" (Sess. xxi. can. i. 2).

Some defenders of the practice are far from trustworthy guides. Keenan's "Controversial Catechism" argues that if Protestants are to take our Lord's words literally, "*Drink ye all of this*," they ought to take literally His direction as to the chalice, "*Divide it among you*," not observing that those words refer to a former part of the Passover feast *before* the institution of the Lord's Supper. So it argues that the bread suffices, because it was only after the giving of the bread that our Lord commanded, "*Do this for*

a commemoration of Me," quoting only from St. Luke (xxii. 19), and not remembering that St. Paul, who received a knowledge of the institution by *express revelation from Christ,*[1] declares that our Lord said the same words when He appointed the receiving of the wine: "*This chalice is the new testament in My blood: this do ye as often as ye shall drink it for the commemoration of Me.*" Equally unfortunate is the comparison drawn between verses 26 and 27; verse 26, referring to the RECEPTION of the Eucharist, enjoins *both* elements to be taken, "*As often as you shall eat this bread* AND *drink this chalice,*" &c., whereas verse 27, referring to any *indignity* offered to the sacrament, shows that an indignity offered to one "OR" the other element equally dishonours Christ, equally ignores Him by not recognising that an indignity to the consecrated sign involves an indignity to the thing signified, even to Christ, as he who insults the Queen's flag insults Majesty itself.[2]

Nor is more weight to be given to the occasional instances of reception in one kind in the case of invalids, infants, the aged, or persons in deserts, or places where wine could not be obtained. Every true Christian must surely remember our Lord's repeated teaching, "*I will have mercy, and not sacrifice.*"

[1] 1 Cor. xi. 23, D.: "I have received *of the Lord* that which I also delivered to you."

[2] These are but instances of the general untrustworthiness of this Catechism.

But these exceptions are not to the point, which is the mode of administering the Eucharist in the Public Services of the Church, and when bread and wine can both be obtained. One other argument is sometimes alleged from the New Testament, viz., that the frequent allusion to the Lord's Supper as "the breaking of bread" (Acts ii. 42, 46, xx. 7) implies that the wine was not considered to be essential. But by the same reasoning, the description of baptism as into "the name of the Lord Jesus" (Acts viii. 16, xix. 5, see also Rom. vi. 3 and Gal. iii. 27) would imply that baptism into the Holy Trinity was not essential. In each case a part is mentioned for the sake of brevity, but the part was evidently intended to include the whole.

Its Novelty.—Honourable Roman writers now almost unanimously give up the appeal to primitive usage. Thus the editors of the Catholic Dictionary write: "Down to the Middle Ages the faithful usually received the Eucharist under both kinds."[1] Two Popes (Leo I., 440, and Gelasius, 490) specially condemned the practice of the Manichæans, who received the bread only, and commanded them to be expelled from the fellowship of saints. It was condemned by the Council of Clermont (1095), and by Pope Pascal II. (1118), as "a human and novel institution," a "departure from what Christ the

[1] Catholic Dictionary.

Master ordained and did." Yet within two hundred years the practice grew in the Roman Church, and the Council of Constance (1415) positively forbad communion in both kinds to the lay people. This action of Rome was strongly resisted. It brought about the long imprisonment and martyrdom of John Hus, and the disgraceful violation of the safe-conduct under which he was induced to attend at Constance. Then came the Hussite war, stimulated by indulgences from Popes, in which tens of thousands of Christians perished. Thus later Popes contradicted earlier ones, and by violence prepared the way for the Reformation.

Reasons Alleged.—(1.) That it is "a safeguard against irreverence lest a drop of the wine should be spilt or drop upon the beard of a communicant." But God can take care of His own honour, and to make such an excuse for evident disobedience to His command is to charge Him with want of wisdom or foresight. So some resist the doctrine of justification by faith on the plea that it may lead to presumption, whereas errors a thousand-fold more dangerous have arisen from disobedience than would ever have arisen from a sincere and hearty reception of Christ's truth. (2.) "The power of the Church to regulate rites and ceremonies" is affirmed; but no Church may "ordain anything contrary to God's written Word."[1] Nor can tradition be produced in support of the dogma.

[1] Art. xx. Church of England.

It is, as Pope Pascal II. described it, "a departure from what Christ the Master ordained and did." (3.) The doctrine of concomitancy is pleaded—*i.e.* the Roman doctrine that "as much is contained under either kind as under both, for Christ whole and entire is under the species of bread, and likewise whole Christ is under the species of wine and under its parts."[1] For this, as already proved, there is no authority in Scripture or the Fathers.[2] Not a hint of such a doctrine is to be found in the teaching of either.

This communion in one kind, though only adopted in the fifteenth century, is the consequence of many previous steps in error. The first was when a confusion was made between the sign and the thing signified; (2) when the doctrine of the real presence in the elements gave rise to the thought of sacrifice; (3) when this sacrifice of Christ was regarded as somewhat propitiatory (Gregory, A.D. 600); (4) when a change in the bread and wine was received and transubstantiation promulgated at the Lateran Council (1215) as a doctrine of the Roman Church; (5) after this the Roman theologians argued for the presence of "whole Christ" in the bread and in the wine; then in every *particle of the bread* and every *drop of the wine.* From this course of "STUPENDOUS MIRACLES,"[3] reception in one kind was an

[1] Council of Trent, Sess. xiii. cap. iii., and *cf.* Can. 3.

[2] Page 128 on Eucharist. [3] See page 129.

easy step, giving a certain completeness to the mournful development of false doctrine.

It is amazing that Romanists do not rise against this indignity to their Lord's command—for many of them love Him with an adoring love—and protest against this curtailment of their spiritual rights. Would that the Roman priests would study the reply of Jehovah's prophet to the disobedient king of Israel: "*And Samuel said, Doth the Lord desire holocausts and victims,* and NOT RATHER THAT THE VOICE OF THE LORD SHOULD BE OBEYED? *For* OBEDIENCE *is better than sacrifices, and to hearken rather than to offer the fat of rams. Because it is like the sin of witchcraft to rebel, and like the crime of idolatry to refuse to obey*" (1 Kings xv. 22, 23, D.; 1 Sam. A.V.).

Doctrines which require such a climax of *disobedience* must be contrary to the mind of Christ.

[The Council of Trent imitating the example of that of Constance confesses that Christ instituted the sacrament in both kinds and that the Apostolic and Primitive Church practised accordingly. Then they asserted that the Church had weighty and just causes for altering the Divine institution, thus asserting that the Church was wiser than her living Head. Our Saviour ordained communion in *both* kinds; the Church of Rome forbids it.]

XXII

TRAFFIC IN MASSES

Q.—What truth is there in the accusation sometimes brought against Rome that her priests sell Masses at a certain price, and so the rich are favoured above the poor?

A.—Among the many benefits that the Reformation of the sixteenth century brought to the Church of Rome was the necessity of reforming the system by which private persons could obtain masses. Having laid down the dogma in the Middle Ages that souls in purgatory can have their torments shortened by the saying of masses, her devotees naturally desired to obtain as many as possible for themselves or their friends. As there was no definite time fixed or known for the continuance of the sufferings of souls in purgatory, the Church shrewdly appointed no limit to the number of masses, or to the duration of their efficacy. Princes and nobles gave lands and erected churches and monasteries on condition that masses should be said for the repose of their souls. So largely was this practised, that in some countries one third of

the land became the property of the Church. Others gave largely in money in their lifetime, or left it at their decease, for the same purpose. The doctrine once received, when money or land could not be largely given, the people were allowed to buy solitary masses for themselves or for the deceased.

The Reformation exposed these practices, and rightly called them "superstitions." Laws of mortmain were enacted to prevent property from being alienated at death for such purposes, and public opinion was so raised that Rome had to correct some of the more flagrant abuses. "By the present laws of the Roman Church, priests are strictly prohibited from saying mass more than once on any day except Christmas Day; and the bishop fixes the amount of stipend, or tax, as it is called, and the priest must not ask, though he may receive, more."[1] These rules have doubtless been laid down to check the ancient "traffic in masses," so that the expression should not be employed. But that the practice of private masses continues, and is a source of great wealth to the Roman Church, cannot be doubted. Not long ago Queen Christina of Spain left money for 5000 masses to be said for herself, and 5000 for her husband, These being for a personal intention, could not be offered by the parish priest under many years, so that they

[1] Cath. Dict. 612, 613.

had to be let out to country priests not fully occupied. More recently the Abbé Brugidou endeavoured to raise money towards building a church in Rome by receiving payment[1] for masses to be said when the church was completed."[2] There is much doubt as to whether the church will ever be built, but 260,000 masses have been already paid for—a number far beyond the power of the Abbé ever to accomplish under the most favourable circumstances. An appeal has been made for masses to be said gratuitously, that the subscribers may not be defrauded. But what must be thought about the system which receives such enormous sums under conditions which cannot be fulfilled without great delay to the souls supposed to be in purgatory! Surely the entire practice is self-condemned. Rome is not ignorant of the abuses, but is powerless to suppress them, for a decree of the Sacred Council on May 25, 1893, renewed a former prohibition of traffic in masses (1874) in these words: "Since in these last years it is plain that these salutary rules have been often neglected, either through ignorance or intention, and that abuses have prevailed largely and widely in this matter, &c."—then rules are laid down to avoid the evil. But the abuse is inherent in the system;

[1] This in England is 5s., or 2s. 6d. for the poor (Bagshawe, p. 187).

[2] "Some Features of Modern Romanism," S.P.C.K., 179.

pruning will do little good: the fallen heart of man is willing to be deceived provided that it can live carelessly on easy terms of ultimate safety. Take the following notice from a Roman Catholic church in Mexico: "Raffle for souls.—At the last raffle for souls the following numbers obtained the prize, and the lucky holders may be assured that their loved ones are for ever released from the flames of purgatory;" then follow numbers and *names*. A further notice follows: "Another raffle for souls will be held at this same blessed Church of the Redeemer on January 1, at which four bleeding and tortured souls will be rescued from purgatory . . . Tickets, one dollar. **Will you, for the poor sum of one dollar, leave your loved ones to burn in purgatory for ages?**"[1]

These modern instances show the extravagance, the uncertainty, and the unrighteousness of the doctrine. Nor must the unfairness of the practice be overlooked, in that the rich can promptly purchase relief from the justice of God, or from His salutary discipline, which the poor cannot. Pope Benedict IV. tried to evade this logical consequence of the sale or purchase of masses by saying: "All souls are God's, and He can give the poor a special share in the general prayers of the Church, and supply all their wants in a thousand ways." But the question is not whether God will

[1] "England's Danger," p. 141, by Dr. Horton.

be really unjust and unfair, but whether the Church of Rome is not misleading and deceiving souls in the matter, causing even her pious members to suppose (1) that they need purgatory and masses in spite of the one all-prevailing sacrifice of Christ, with the perfect remission of the guilt of sin to all who believe in Him; and (2) then inducing them to give large money to the priests to say so many masses according to the amount paid, and that without any authority from Scripture or the use of the Primitive Church.

Surely God will judge and punish the *deceivers* in this unholy system, however great His mercy to the deceived

---

[The Roman Church diligently inculcates the teaching that the sufferers in purgatory have their pains diminished by the suffrages of the living. Hence this doctrine is a constant source of revenue by means of masses for the dead in hopes of speedy release from purgatory. A more easy method of filling Rome's coffers could not have been invented, and the pages of history tell us that the traffic in masses have and still are filling these coffers to repletion.]

XXIII

JUSTIFICATION AND SANCTIFICATION

Q.—How does the doctrine of Justification as taught by Romanists differ from that taught by Protestants?

A.—The differences are many and important. The Roman doctrine confuses Justification with Sanctification; it assigns an incorrect meaning to the Scripture term "justify"; it introduces a doctrine of human Merit, and even leads to the assumption that man can perform works of Supererogation, contrary to the experience of saints and the express statements of God's Holy Word. On each of these points it is necessary to have clear views.

JUSTIFICATION CONFUSED WITH SANCTIFICATION. —The Church of Rome teaches (Council of Trent, Sess. vi. ch. vii. xvi.), "justification is not remission of sins merely, but also the sanctification and renewal of the inward man." Protestants follow the definite teaching of the New Testament, in which justification refers to the GROUND of the sinner's acceptance with God, viz., by faith in the

meritorious sacrifice of Christ, and sanctification to the gradual growth of the Christian character in its conformity to the mind and pattern of the perfect Son of Man, Christ Jesus, by the continued assistance of the Holy Spirit and use of the means of grace. This is fully expressed in the 11th and 12th Articles of the Church of England. In the former it is stated that "we are accounted righteous before God only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ by faith, and not for our own works or deservings," adding, "Wherefore that we are justified by faith only is a most wholesome doctrine and very full of comfort." To this is joined the 12th Article, which asserts that "good works are the *fruits* of faith, and follow after justification . . . and that they spring out *necessarily* of a true and lively faith, insomuch that by them a lively faith may be as evidently known as a tree discerned by the fruit."

This view of Justification is the keynote of all St. Paul's teaching. Thus the apostle affirms (Rom. iii. 20, R.V.): "*By the works of the law shall no flesh be justified in His sight. . . . But now, apart from the law a righteousness of God hath been manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets, even the righteousness of God through faith in Jesus Christ unto all them that believe.*" Again (Rom. iii. 28, R.V.): "*We reckon therefore that a man is justified by faith apart from the works of the law.*" By God's gracious

appointment, the Incarnate Son "*Who knew no sin, He (God) made to be sin on our behalf, that we might become the righteousness of God in Him*" (2 Cor. v. 21, R.V.), for "*Christ is the end of the law unto righteousness* (or justification) *to every one that believeth*" (Rom. x. 4), "*Being therefore justified by faith, we have peace with God* (Rom. v. 1), *through our Lord Jesus Christ.*" These are but examples of the general teaching of the New Testament. They uniformly declare that the *ground* of the sinner's justification, *i.e.* of his being accounted and treated as righteous by God, is the righteousness of God's dear Son, apprehended and appropriated by a personal living faith. Not that faith justifies by any merit or virtue in itself, but as it accepts the free gift of reconciliation and atonement through the blood of Christ, and it is ever accompanied by union with the sole fountain of all grace and merit.

This view is confirmed by the strict meaning of the verb to "JUSTIFY" as used in Scripture. It will be noticed that Romanists regard justification as the act by which a man is *made* just: Protestants as an act (of faith) by which he is *declared, accounted,* and *treated* as righteous. The Hebrew word for "justify" in the Old Testament sometimes signifies to *impart* righteousness;[1] more frequently

[1] See Isa. liii. 11, and xlv. 24, 25. "It is elaborately asserted that 'only in the Lord' shall regenerate Israel be justified."—*Speaker's Commentary.*

to be *counted*, or *declared*, or *treated* as righteous; never to be *made* just or righteous. The corresponding Greek word, as used in the New Testament, never admits the meaning "*to be*" righteous or "*to be made*" righteous or just. It is always used in a forensic sense—to be *accounted*, *reckoned*, or *treated* as righteous, so that the Romanist view is utterly inconsistent with the correct meaning and constant usage. We are not *made* righteous—the marvel is that any one should presume to think so—but we are *accounted and treated as righteous* through the merits of Jesus Christ, who "*suffered for sins once, the righteous for the unrighteous, to bring us to God*" (1 Peter iii. 18, R.V.).

SANCTIFICATION INSEPARABLE FROM JUSTIFICATION.—Rome's confusion of justification with sanctification, notwithstanding the contrary teaching of Scripture, is probably the result of a certain fear or suspicion as to the possible perversions of the doctrine of justification by faith only. But such objections and suspicions were brought forward at the very time that the doctrine was first proclaimed by St. Paul. The apostle, assuming the possibility of the objection, demanded, "*Shall we continue in sin that grace may abound?*" "*Shall we sin because we are not under the law but under grace?*" (Rom. vi. 1 and 15, D.—read the whole chapter). Questions to which he replied indignantly, "*God forbid! How shall we that are dead to sin live any longer therein?*"

(ver. 2, D.). Some so violently resisted this teaching, and perverted it, that St. Paul tells us the apostles were "*slandered, and some affirmed that they said, 'Let us do evil that there may come good.'*" Respecting whom he wrote solemnly, "*whose damnation is just*" (Rom. iii. 8, D.). Satan has invented a counterfeit for every divine gift, and St. Jude (ver. 4, D.) mentions "*impious*" persons in his day who were "*turning the grace of our God into lasciviousness;*" but truth is not responsible for such perversions of wicked minds.

Justification arises from that conviction of sin and of guilt which is the first work of God's Holy Spirit upon the conscience, producing repentance and a change of heart. This by itself would lead to despair, but it is accompanied by the revelation of Jesus Christ, of His righteousness, and of the sufficiency of His stupendous sacrifice as an offering for sin. This the convicted soul embraces, appropriates by faith, and is justified. Thus it is evident that faith is not the trust or persuasion of one *at ease* or *careless* about sin, but of one who feeling himself condemned by God's righteous law, believes the testimony of God's Word with regard to its remedy through the person and work of Christ Jesus. How can such an one, "baptized into Christ's death," united to Christ as the branch is to the vine, continue to live wilfully in sin? Impossible. Thus sanctification as a growth in grace, a constantly

progressive assimilation to the mind and life of the Lord Jesus, is inseparable from justification. "God accounts men righteous for the sake of Christ's righteousness; but He at the *same time* works in them that internal righteousness which comes from their union with Christ and indwelling of His Spirit."[1] Henceforth men *see their good works and glorify God* (Matt. v. 16).

By Faith only, or by Faith alone.—These words are often misquoted, because misunderstood. Calvin used to say, "We are justified by faith alone, but not by that faith which is alone," *i.e.* the faith that justifies is alone as to the *ground* of our acceptance with God, but not alone as regards the gracious consequences of a "righteous, sober, and godly life" (Titus ii. 12). Luther was equally clear on this point. With him the faith that justifies was a faith that believed *all* the promises and precepts of the Divine Word. Thus he wrote, "We know indeed that *faith is never alone*, but brings charity with it and other manifold gifts. For he who believes in God, that He favours us and gave His Son, and with His Son eternal life, how should he not love God with all his heart? How should he not reverence Him? How should he not prove his obedience to God by enduring adversity? So faith draws with it a most beautiful chorus of virtues: nor is it ever alone. But things are *not therefore to be confounded*,

[1] Bishop Harold Browne.

and that which is of faith to be attributed to other virtues."[1]

Justification by faith, so far from being likely to diminish the graces and good works of a Christian's life, is most calculated to inspire and multiply them. The soul that is burdened with a sense of uncertainty as to its salvation, which is ever turning to confessions and penances, to priests and saints, may work from *fear*, but the spirit of a slave never yields the bright, cheerful, and prompt obedience which springs from reconciliation and sonship. There is a rest, a joyousness, a gratitude, a perpetual sense of the presence and love of God which stimulates the soul conscious of reconciliation and atonement to higher things. The words of Christ are realised, "*I call you not servants, but friends;*" or, as St. Paul puts it, "*Ye have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear, but the spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father.*"[2] "*The love of Christ constrains us.*" Justification is the only source of power for sanctification.

Popular Romish Misrepresentations.—Whilst the Council of Trent has been credited with a certain genuine fear lest carelessness of conduct should result from the doctrine of justification by faith only, the same cannot be said of certain misrepresentations of the doctrine which are largely

[1] Luther in Gen. cap. xv.
[2] Rom. viii. 12–16.

disseminated by Romish manuals in England. Thus the book entitled "Catholic Belief,"[1] page 49, ridicules the Protestant doctrine in this language: "Justifying is not dressing splendidly a dead man's body; it is vivifying it. It is not covering a leprosy with a beautiful shining dress; it is curing it thoroughly. What unspeakable regrets it would leave in the justified man if he had ever to see his soul, indeed magnificently arrayed, still in itself stained with sin, deformed, black, and horrible as before." The quotations from Luther's writings, from the Articles of the Church of England, and above all from the Word of God, rebut and confute the language of the writer. Let such parodies and wilful misrepresentations be carefully eschewed.

THE TEACHING OF THE FATHERS.—The controversies of the Early Church related more to the person of Christ than to the doctrine of grace, so that the Fathers were accustomed to speak generally of our salvation as due to the meritorious death of Christ without those distinctions which arose in aftertimes. The following quotations, however, will show that they were in fundamental agreement

[1] By Dr. Di Bruno. It is difficult to believe that such a learned man did not know the Protestant doctrine more correctly. Then why did he pervert it and misrepresent it? If he ever met with a person holding such views, he must have known that he was unworthy of credit.

with the Scriptural views recovered at the Reformation. It is remarkable—and Romanism would do well to observe it—that Clement, one of the first bishops of Rome, writes clearly on the subject. Speaking of faithful men of old, he says: "They all therefore were glorified and magnified, not through themselves or their own works, or the righteous doing which they wrought, but through His. And so we, having been called through His will in Christ Jesus, are not justified through ourselves or through our own wisdom, or understanding, or piety, or works which we wrought in holiness of heart, but through faith, whereby the Almighty God justified all men that have been from the beginning; to whom be the glory for ever and ever. Amen."[1] St. Chrysostom has left a striking passage—(on Rom. viii. 34, "It is God that justifieth, who is he that condemneth?")—"He does not say, it is God who forgave us our sins, but what is much greater—*It is God that justifieth.* For when the judge's sentence declares us just, and such a judge too, what signifieth the accuser?" St. Basil: "This is perfect and complete joy in God, when one is not lifted up in the conceit of his own righteousness, but knows that he himself is wanting in true righteousness, and that he is justified only by faith in Christ." St. Bernard: "Thou art as strong to justify as Thou art ready to pardon. Wherefore whosoever, smitten with compunction

[1] Clemens Rom., Ep. i. cap. 32, Bp. Lightfoot's translation.

for his sins, hungers and thirsts after righteousness, let him believe on Thee who justifiest the ungodly: and being justified by faith alone, he will have peace with God."[1] This is surely the teaching of the Reformers.

[1] Quoted in "England *v.* Rome," by Swete, p. 34.

["The re-discovery of the meaning of justification by faith was the soul of the Reformation. It was its inspiration; its life; its victory. It came to the individual reformer as a revelation; to the Church as a revolution. But its starting-point was opened eyes and regenerated hearts. It began as good tidings of great joy to each.

To Latimer as to Luther the glorious fact that he, a poor sinner, was accepted and justified by simply receiving God's grace as a free gift by faith came as an almost incredible surprise. It swept over his soul as the sunshine, bringing peace and joy. . . . It was the universal conception of mediæval piety that the mediation of the priest was essential to salvation. It was this universally accepted power of a mediatorial priesthood which had enslaved Europe."

Dr. Dyson Hague, Article on Justification in volume entitled "Evangelicalism." (Thynne & Jarvis, Ltd., 1925, price 4s. and 6s.)]

XXIV

WORKS OF MERIT AND SUPEREROGATION

Q.—What is Rome's teaching as to Merit and works of Supererogation, and how are they connected with her doctrine of justification?

A.—To those who have probed their own hearts and meditated upon sin by *the light of God's countenance* (Ps. xc. 8), the word "merit" has a strange sound. Yet, as regards merit, the Church of Rome teaches that man, if already justified, "through such good works as he does by the grace of God and merit of Christ, whose living member he is, truly *merits* increase of grace, eternal life, and the actual attainment of eternal life, if he dies in grace" (Council of Trent, Sess. vi. can. 32). In direct contrast with this, St. Paul tells us that, "*The* GIFT *of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord*" (Rom. vi. 23); whereas, "*To him that worketh the reward is not reckoned as of grace, but as of debt*" (Rom. iv. 4). When a blessing is a *free gift*, there can be no room for merit: it must be of free unmerited favour, as the word "grace" implies.

Those Romanists who write for English readers are very cautious and reserved upon these points. "Christ puts us into a condition to merit greater degrees of glory," says Keenan, whilst Di Bruno carefully omits all reference to works of supererogation, and writes: "All our merits are grounded upon the merits of Christ, yet to the justified they are truly our own merits." In all such statements there is a tendency to flatter the sinner and to minimise the guilt of his sin, and in equal proportion to depreciate the unique love and the sole merit of the Son of God. Well do Protestants affirm that, whilst the good works of the justified are well-pleasing to God, yet they cannot put away our sins and endure the strictness (*severitatem*) of God's judgment" (Art. xii.). The Psalmist cried out, "*If Thou, O Lord, wilt mark iniquities, Lord, who shall stand it?*" (Ps. cxxix. 3, D.). Our confidence is not in our merit, but in God's compassion, "*for with Thee there is merciful forgiveness.*" St. Paul describes the conflict which more or less goes on in every soul: "*When I have a will to do good, evil is present with me*" (Rom. vii. 21, D.). Self-examination soon brings to light defect of motive or of consistency. The more saintly a man is, and the more enlightened his conscience, the more does he grow in humility and self-condemnation. The humblest words came from the greatest of apostles in his old age, in the prospect of martyrdom, in the near

vision of the "crown of righteousness: "*This is a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptation, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners, of whom I am* CHIEF."[1] The Roman doctrine of merit, or of *condignity*,[2] is thus contrary to the experience of saints and to the Word of God. The Fathers sometimes use the word "merit," but only in the sense "to procure or to attain" (Ussher). Their witness is as decided as that of Protestants. St. Jerome says, "If we consider our own merits, we must despair." St. Anselm: "If a man should serve God a thousand years, he would not deserve, of condignity, to be half a day in the kingdom of heaven."[3] Saints in those days had a deeper sense of the sinfulness of sin than is now taught by Rome.

WORKS OF SUPEREROGATION.—The word "supererogation" signifies "paying more than is demanded." It is applied to those works of saints which are done voluntarily, and which are supposed to be over and above the requirements of God's commandments. The *word* itself does not appear in the Tridentine decrees, but what it implies is abundantly taught in her doctrine of indulgence—a doctrine which assumes that the Pope has at his disposal a "treasury of grace," consisting partly of the merits of Christ and partly of those merits of

[1] 1 Tim. i. 14, 15, 16. [2] Worthiness to merit.
[3] From "England *v.* Rome."

saints which are more than they needed for their own salvation. After the passages already given on the subject of merit, it may well be concluded that the doctrine of "works of supererogation cannot be taught without arrogancy and impiety."[1] Does the Lord's Prayer ever become *obsolete?* Are any members of the Roman Church freed from the necessity of praying, "*Forgive us our debts as we forgive our debtors*"? Will any one affirm—does any one taught by God's Holy Spirit *feel*, that he is keeping the ten commandments perfectly in their deep and spiritual signification, as taught by our Saviour in His sermon on the mount? Did St. John write falsely, "*If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us*"? Whence, then, comes an obedience beyond what God requires, beyond what is His due? The attempt is made to distinguish between positive precepts and COUNSELS OF PERFECTION, as if the former were necessary, but not the latter. The virtues of poverty and chastity are reckoned among the counsels of perfection. These have their place from time to time in the Christian life, but to those who *feel called* to such states of life, these (so-called) counsels of perfection *become positive commands*, and must be obeyed as such. The recommendations by St. Paul respecting marriage were mainly due to what he regarded as "the present distress," *i.e.* the perse-

[1] Art. xiv., Church of England.

cutions which then beset the Church, and they may well apply in the present day to missionaries going to difficult and dangerous missions. But in any case, to suppose that there is a fixed measure of obedience beyond which it is not necessary to go, is "impiety," since the *perfection of God* is the standard, and no one will dare to say that he has attained to our Lord's direction to be "holy as God is holy." Again, to imagine that we do more than we are bound to do is "arrogance," because we ourselves—body, soul, and spirit—are entirely God's, so that we owe ourselves and all that we have to His service. Where ALL is thus owing, it is impossible that *part* can be overpay.[1] Christ saith plainly, "*When you shall have done all the things that are commanded you, say, We are unprofitable servants*" (Luke xvii. 10, D.). If "unprofitable," how can there be excess?

[1] Green on the Articles.

[Works of supererogation cannot be taught without arrogance and impiety. For by them men do declare that they not only render unto God as much as they are bound to do, but that they do more for His sake than of bounden duty is required; whereas Christ says plainly, "When ye have done all that is commanded of you, say, We are unprofitable servants." (Upper House of Convocation, 1562. Of works of supererogation.)]

XXV

FUTURE REWARDS

Q.—But if there be no Merit, how can the promise of Reward hold good at the last day?

A.—Nothing is more certain than that we do not take away the *rewards* of a holy life because we deny the *merit* of good works wrought by faith in Christ and the power of His Spirit. The equity of the future judgment is constantly insisted upon in the Bible. As regards the wicked, our Lord declared that some should be beaten with *many* stripes and some with *few* (Luke xii. 47, 48, D.), according to the degree and nature of their guilt. So again and again the promise of reward is set forth, and that in proportion to opportunity, faithfulness, zeal, and love. The Lord Himself declares, "*Behold, I come quickly, and My reward is with Me, to give to every man according as his work shall be.*" This our Blessed Lord taught in His parables of the talents and of the pounds. This St. Paul announced in his doctrine of the resurrection, "*There is one glory of the sun, and another glory of the moon, and another glory of the stars: for one star differeth from another star in*

glory. So also is the resurrection of the dead." This has cheered and animated the Christian in all ages as he suffered tribulation and fought the good fight of faith. But the question is, *on what ground* does the believer expect so great a reward? From God's justice or from God's mercy? from merit or from promise? "A man who merits can claim his reward as a matter of justice; but one who by way of promise *receives out of all proportion to the work done*, may appeal to the *fidelity and kindness*, but not, strictly speaking, to the *justice* of the donor."[1] Such is the admission of a Romanist. Surely this applies to the whole method of God's gracious dealing with man in the matter of rewards. His rewards are out of all proportion to our imperfect and unworthy services. No one can *earn* the white robe of saints, or the crown of life, or the glories of the New Jerusalem, or the beatific vision, or a place on the right hand of the throne of God and of the Lamb. These can only be *gifts* arising from God's loving kindness and tender mercy, only because "*He is faithful Who hath promised.*" As St. Augustine said, "He will crown us in mercy and pity"; as the Psalmist, "*Unto Thee, O Lord, belongeth* MERCY, *for Thou renderest to every man according to his work*";[2] As Hosea, *Sow to yourselves in righteousness; reap in mercy.*"[3] That the rewards will be proportionate

[1] Catholic Dictionary.

[2] Ps. lxii. 12.

[3] Hosea x. 12.

implies no merit, only faithfulness and growth in grace on the saint's part and strict impartiality on the part of God, who limits Himself by His promises and by those rules of equity which characterise all His dealings with mankind. Nay, it must be so from the very nature of grace, for every increase in grace involves an increase in capacity for the heavenly fellowship and enjoyments. *"Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God"*; and in proportion to this purity will be the brightness and clearness and glory of the eternal vision.

XXVI

PURGATORY

Q.—The general idea of Purgatory is very attractive to many. What is the real teaching of Rome as to its purpose, nature, and duration?

A.—The attractiveness of the doctrine of a purgatory after death doubtless arises from the popular notion that it gives every soul a second chance of salvation, and further from the idea that it affords the means of compensation for an easy and self-indulgent life. The first notion is not strictly correct, since the Church of Rome holds firmly that there is no forgiveness for those who die in mortal sin, and that they must suffer an eternity of punishment. But that the doctrine of purgatory suggests the means of compensation for a careless life is only too evident to those who understand its teaching and practical working. Both Protestants and Romanists hold that there is an intermediate state between death and the final judgment by the Son of Man at the resurrection; but whereas Protestants believe from the teaching of Holy Scripture that the souls of the

justified enter *at once* into "joy and felicity,"[1] to be consummated at the second coming of Christ,[2] the Romanists hold that the justified at death, with certain exceptions, enter into a place of punishment for an indefinite time. The contrast between these two doctrines will be seen from the following statements :—

Church of Rome.	Protestant Churches.
"If any one saith that after the gift of justification has been received, to every penitent sinner the guilt is remitted and the debt of eternal punishment is blotted out in such wise that there remains not any debt of temporal punishment to be discharged either in this world or in the next in purgatory, before the entrance to the kingdom of heaven can be opened (to him) : let him be anathema."—*Council of Trent*, Sess. vi. c. xxx.	"Almighty God, with whom do live the spirits of them that depart hence in the Lord, and with whom the souls of the faithful, after they are delivered from the burden of the flesh, are in joy and felicity . . . hasten Thy kingdom, that we, with all those departed in the true faith of Thy Holy Name, may have our perfect consummation and bliss, both in body and soul, in Thy eternal and everlasting glory."—*Order for the Burial of the Dead.*
"For those who are departed in Christ and who are not yet fully purified, it (the sacrifice of the mass) is rightly offered, agreeably to a tradition of the Apostles."—*Council of Trent*, Sess. xxii. c. ii.	"The Romish doctrine concerning purgatory, pardons (indulgences) . . . is a fond (weak) thing, vainly invented and grounded on no warranty of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the Word of God."—Art. xxii.

[1] The intermediate state in the New Testament is called HADES. Our Saviour went down into Hades at death (Acts ii. 31, R.V.), *i.e.* into the *happy* portion of it called Paradise (Luke xxiii. 43), and likewise the penitent robber. See also Luke xvi. 22, 23, R.V.).

[2] Burial Service of Church of England.

Romanist writers teach distinctly that purgatory is not a place of probation. "All the souls in purgatory have died in the love of God and are certain to enter heaven, but they are (supposed to be) not as yet pure enough to see God." "The time of merit expires with this life, and the debt of temporal *punishment* must still be paid."[1] Those souls go to purgatory "which depart in venial sin, or which have not fully paid the debt of temporal *punishment* due to their sins, the guilt of which has been forgiven,"[2] yet "demanded by God's justice."[3] "Souls in purgatory are not merely undergoing a process of cleansing but of *expiation*, and it is in both processes that the suffrages of the Church militant bear a part."[4]

The NATURE of Purgatorial Punishment. Before the Reformation the sufferings were almost universally believed to arise from literal tormenting fires, and such is the general belief in Romish countries, where shocking pictures of souls suffering the anguish of fire are of frequent occurrence on the roadsides, to be seen by every traveller.[5] "It is the common belief of the Western (Roman) Church that they (souls in purgatory) are tormented by material fire, and it is quite conceivable that God should give matter the power of constraining and afflicting even separated souls. The

[1] Roman Catholic Dictionary. [2] Catechism of Trent.
[3] Di Bruno. [4] Ryder: "Cath. Cont.," p. 222.
[5] Forbes, ii. 307.

saints and doctors describe these pains as very terrible." Sir Thomas More supposed them to be only by fire; Bishop Fisher,[1] by fire and water; Aquinas made them as violent as hell; Durandus gives them intermission on Sundays and holidays. Bellarmine declares, "*It is the very same sensible punishment* which the sinner ought to have suffered in hell, with the exception of its *eternity*." Pope Benedict XIV. fully explains the Roman doctrine, remarking on a certain part of the Canon of the Mass, that the priest therein prays "for all those who are expiating in the *fire of purgatory*"; and requests for them all "a place of cooling," which refers to *that fire in which they* are burning; "a place of light," which relates to that *darkness* in which they are; "a place of repose," which regards that *anxiety of mind* with which they are struggling; by which threefold species of punishments those miserable souls are expiated by the DIVINE JUSTICE."[2] Surely an infallible Pope should know the Roman doctrine!

The modern form of presenting the character of purgatory greatly differs from the mediæval idea of material fire, which is still maintained amongst the mass of Romanists. An attempt is made to adapt it to modes of English thought and enlightenment. Some apologists omit, but cannot deny, the idea of

[1] The Bishop says souls in Purgatory can scarcely remember anything, and cannot praise God because of their torments. —"Fisherii Opera," p. 1473.

[2] Benedict XIV., De Sacrificio Missæ.

punishment, and dwell only upon a *purification* as needful to prepare the soul for the "awful" presence of God; or they explain away or pass by the fiery torments, alleging "they suffer the pains of loss, *i.e.* they suffer anguish because their past sins exclude them for a season from the sight of God, and they understand the infinite bliss from which they are excluded, and the foulness of the least offence against God."[1] These are only private opinions adopted to lessen the repulsiveness of the doctrine; they have no authority as against the statements of Pope Benedict.

DURATION.—The teaching as to the duration of suffering in purgatory differs as widely and is as uncertain as that upon the nature of purgatorial punishment. The more cautious are indefinite—"they last no doubt for very different lengths of time, and vary in intensity according to the need of individual cases."[2] It would be more truthful to say that, according to Rome's teaching, the duration varies according to the amount of masses that are paid for and the number of indulgences obtained by the use of scapulars, visits to certain shrines, and observance of litanies to the Virgin, &c., by which the punishment of purgatory can be commuted and shortened. "Thus, before the Reformation, indulgences were granted, according to an ancient book, 'The House of the Most Blessed Virgin Mary,' for

[1] Catholic Dictionary. [2] *Ibid.*

terms varying from a few weeks to ninety thousand years. It is due to the Reformation that these appalling features have been withdrawn, but the doctrine remains as real and deceiving as ever."[1] There is more reticence in the modern teaching to prevent its revolting side from being so easily detected by Protestants. The duration is left indefinite and indulgences are multiplied.

UNCERTAINTY prevails on every point of the doctrine. It is not certainly known *who do and who do not go* to purgatory. All martyrs are excluded, yet it is known that many suffered martyrdom from obstinacy, and not from piety and grace. So those "who die free from sin and debt of temporal punishment" are exempted; but it is so impossible to discover such, that the doctrines of indulgences and intercessions are inculcated upon all. Then the deliverance is uncertain; the masses, prayers, and indulgences are offered by way of *suffrage* only—"that is, it is a ransom offered, admittedly sufficient, but the *application* of which in *this* or *that degree*, to *this or that person*, IS NOT COVENANTED, though confidently expected in answer to the Church's prayer."[2] So Sixtus IV., in his Constitution of November 27, 1477: "The Church has no direct power over the souls of the departed. She can but humbly entreat God to accept the merits of it, and having respect

[1] Tyler on Pardons, &c., ii. 18.

[2] Ryder's "Catholic Controversy," p. 221.

to them, mercifully to remit the whole or a portion of the pains due to the souls suffering in purgatory."[1]

Evils Arising from the Doctrine.—The more thoroughly the doctrine of purgatory is examined and sifted, the more emphatically will the inquirer arrive at the conclusion of the 22nd Article of the English Church, that "Purgatory is a fond thing (*res futilis*), vainly invented and founded upon no warranty of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the Word of God." Two great evils are connected with its belief:—

(1) Its practical tendency is to pander to human neglect and carelessness in religion and the spiritual life. It tends to weaken all our Lord's solemn words as to the need of immediate repentance and cultivation of holiness. The Greek Church objected to it on this ground[2]—"the proposed doctrine of purgatory ought to be cast out of the Church as *leading on to negligence* in the minds of the zealous, and dissuading them from striving to purify themselves in this present life with all their energies, by holding out the expectation of another purgation yet to come." If this may be the effect upon the "zealous," how dangerously paralysing the doctrine must be upon the *frivolous*, the *worldly*, and *indifferent!* All ordinary motives to conversion and decision are chilled and deadened by it in the vast majority of cases, whilst the hearts of timid, tender

[1] Catholic Dictionary.

[2] Jenkins' "Romanism," pp. 173, 177, and Archbishop Philaret's Catechism.

souls "are made sad whom God hath not made sad,"[1] by the anticipation of purgatorial sufferings and pains after the article of death.

(2) A yet greater evil is the dishonour which it casts upon the redeeming work of the incarnate Son of God. As with most essentially Roman doctrines, saint-worship, Mariolatry, merits, indulgences, the mass, so with purgatory; it takes away from the fulness of Christ's present love to His Church, from the completeness and sufficiency of His sacrifice and mediatorial work. If redemption had been entrusted to an archangel, the possible need of supplementing His mediatorial work might have been tolerated. But when it is "God in Christ" Who has taken our nature and laid down His own life for the specific purpose of "reconciling the world unto Himself,"[2] and Who has made "propitiation for the sins of the whole world"[3] on the altar of the Cross, this constant attempt, or rather injunction, to supplement our Lord's work of expiation and redemption as if it were inherently deficient, is an act of *disloyalty* to our Lord Himself, injurious to the Church which exalts itself instead of Christ, and a sore hindrance to the soul's present enjoyment of "joy and peace in believing" (Rom. xv. 13).

[1] Ezek. xiii. 22: "With lies ye have made the heart of the righteous sad, whom I (Jehovah) have not made sad; and strengthened the hands of the wicked, that he should not return from his wicked way, by promising him life."

[2] 2 Cor. v. 19–21. [3] 1 John ii. 1, 2.

XXVII

NO EVIDENCE FOR PURGATORY

Q.—Surely this doctrine of Purgatory requires strong evidence. What proofs does Rome allege in its support?

A.—There is probably no doctrine of any Church so utterly devoid of evidence as the Roman doctrine of purgatory. Confessedly no proof can be drawn from the canonical Scriptures. The editors of the Roman Catholic Dictionary (fourth edition) candidly allow that the passages usually brought forward from the New Testament are not applicable. Thus they admit that the "fire" spoken of by St. Paul (1 Cor. iii. 13) is not to purify, but to test; and it is not a present fire, but is placed at the end of the world and at the judgment; that our Lord's words, "*hath never forgiveness*" (Mark. iii. 29), exclude purgatory, because they refer only to this world and to the new world (*that which is to come*) to be ushered in by the coming of Christ; and on Matt. v. 25, 26, they agree with St. Augustine that the "*last farthing*" will never and can never be repaid. So with regard to Matt. xviii. 34, they remark that a slave could never pay the enormous sum of 10,000 talents, and

quote approvingly the words of Remigius (in tenth century), "semper solvet sed nunquam persolvet,"[1] which interpretation agrees with Augustine's. This candour in dealing with these passages deserves courteous recognition. After these concessions, it is the more to be regretted that they should rely upon a solitary passage in the apocryphal book of 2 Macc. xii. 42–45. This relates how Judas Maccabæus, on discovering that those who were slain had been guilty of idolatry, "sent the sum of 2000 drachms of silver to Jerusalem to offer a sin-offering, in that he was mindful of the resurrection . . . whereupon he made a reconciliation for the dead that they might be delivered from sin." Whatever the meaning of the passage in the mind of the author, it should be observed (1) that it could not refer to the Romish doctrine of purgatory, since idolatry is a *mortal* sin which purgatory is expressly unable to remove; (2) that the book is apocryphal.[2] It was not contained in that canon of inspired books recognised and quoted by our Lord and the apostles as "the Scriptures" or the "lively oracles of God," and is thus without authority. St. Jerome, the author of the Latin Vulgate —Rome's authorised edition of the Bible—did not recognise it as "canonical."[3] He truly remarked that it cannot be used to establish any doctrine.

[1] "He will always be paying, but will never pay off."

[2] Rome should remember another apocryphal book, in which it is said, "The souls of the righteous are in the hands of God, and *there shall no torment touch them*" (Wisdom iii. 1–3).

[3] See p. 98.

No Evidence from the Fathers.—There was considerable variety of opinions amongst early Christian writers as to the condition of the soul immediately after death, but it may be fearlessly stated that the present Roman doctrine of purgatory was to them unknown. Justin Martyr (A.D. 140) taught, "All souls do not die," but that "the souls of the pious remain in some BETTER PLACE, and the unrighteous and wicked in a *worse* place, expecting the time of judgment." Irenæus (A.D. 170), commenting on the parable of Dives, writes: "By this it is plainly declared that souls continue to exist . . . and that each people (*i.e.* the good and the bad) receive a fitting habitation even before the day of judgment." Tertullian (A.D. 200) taught: "We do an injury to Christ when we hear without equanimity that any have been called away by Him as if *they deserved commiseration.* 'I desire,' said the apostle, 'to be received presently, and to be with Christ.' Here is no notion that the souls of justified men are consigned to torments." According to St. Basil (A.D. 375), the moment of death is the beginning of the believer's happiness. He said, "If the dissolution of this life, by which the soul is delivered from the bondage of the flesh, is the *commencement of true life* to those who live according to God, why are we grieved as if we had no hope?" So his friend, Gregory Nazianzen, "I am persuaded by the words of the wise that every soul which is

good and beloved of God, when loosened from the bonds of the flesh, *immediately* feels and contemplates the good which awaits . . . and *enjoys a certain wondrous pleasure, and rejoiceth,* and joyfully goeth to its Lord, escaping from this life as from a grievous prison. . . . But after a little it receives again its native flesh, and with it enjoys heavenly glory." St. John Chrysostom has a number of passages to the same effect. This is not Roman doctrine, but the doctrine of those who believe that the justified, "after they are delivered from the burden of the flesh, are in joy and felicity."[1]

PRAYERS FOR THE DEAD.—This early custom is often pleaded in behalf of purgatory. Nothing could be weaker. Prayers for the pious dead were undoubtedly almost universal in the early history of the Church (including prayers and intercessions for the Virgin Mary), that the saints might advance in holiness and happiness, but they were *never* connected with this doctrine of purgatory. The Eastern Church (Greek) still practises prayers for the dead, but rejects the Roman doctrine of purgatory.[2] Bishop Fisher wrote: "On the subject of purgatory and indulgences there is no mention, or at least the very rarest, among the ancients; *and the Greeks*

[1] See Harold Browne, 492, 3; and Palmer's "Letters to Wiseman."

[2] The Greeks generally believe in an intermediate state where many souls suffer spiritual pains of conscience. These may be helped by prayers and sacrifices of the altar.—Schaff's "Creeds of Christendom."

to this day do not believe that there is any purgatory;" so the supposed necessary deduction is invalid. Prayer for the dead may be excused on the ground of natural instinct or strong affection, but it finds no support in Holy Scripture. St. Paul's prayer for Onesiphorus is often quoted under the supposition that he was dead at the time, but many learned commentators deny that the supposition is well founded, and no argument can be built on a single text, and that a controverted one. It is much wiser to follow the custom and example set in the Anglican prayer for the Church militant, and to "THANK God for those departed this life in His faith and fear." Such tribute of thankfulness in our private and public devotions will maintain the memory of the departed and satisfy the heart's purest and strongest affection.

DEBT OF TEMPORAL PUNISHMENT.—The argument most relied upon by Romanists in defence of purgatory is the one alluded to in the Tridentine Council, viz., that a debt of temporal punishment remains to be discharged in purgatory. It is said that "as punishment often continues to fall on the pardoned penitent during life, it must pursue those who have not much temporal suffering (in their lifetime) after death." But this is a bare assertion, without support from reason or Scripture. It is quite true that the pardoned penitent in many cases has to suffer the natural and inevitable consequences of his past

sins. A special miracle would be needed to prevent them. Disease, poverty, loss of reputation, and the like, are the frequent and almost necessary results of drink, gambling, and of such sins as those of Lot, David, and Jacob—sins of avarice, impurity, and deceit. They are the effects of wise, providential laws (1) to discourage others from sinning; (2) to prevent carelessness in the penitent; (3) to foster prayer and watchfulness, faith and humility, so long as the soul remains in a world of temptation. But these are no longer necessary when the soul enters that state where temptations do not exist and wickedness has ceased, and the body is no longer present as an instrument of iniquity. St. John affirms that "*the blood of Jesus Christ cleanses us from all sin.*" If from all sin, then from all guilt; and if from all guilt, then from all punishment, though sufferings, as a *natural consequence* of special sins, may work on until this present season of discipline is ended. The Fathers condemn the doctrine that any punishments are due to remitted sins as such. "Where the guilt is removed," says Tertullian, "the punishment is so likewise." "Where there is grace there is remission," says St. Chrysostom; "where there is remission there is no punishment." St. Bernard writes beautifully: "He so wholly pardoned and so liberally forgave every injury, that He now does not condemn *by revenging*, nor confounds by upbraiding, nor loves less by imputing. Some

there are who forgive injury so as not to revenge it, but still they upbraid. Others there are who are silent, though somewhat remains deeply rooted in their minds, and they retain rancour. In neither case is there full pardon. Far from these is the benignant nature of the Godhead. HE ACTS WITH LIBERALITY: HE FORGIVES ENTIRELY."[1]

We read in Holy Scripture that our adorable Redeemer became incarnate, "*that through death He might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil; and* DELIVER *them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage.*"[2] If there is a purgatory, Christ had failed; the bondage must continue. But it is not so. "*There is now no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus.*"[3] "*Being justified by His blood,* WE ARE SAVED FROM WRATH *through Him.*"[4] "*God hath not appointed us unto* WRATH, *but to obtain salvation by our Lord Jesus Christ, who died for us, that,* WHETHER WE WAKE OR SLEEP, *we should live together with Him.*"[5]

Which is most worthy of the reader's trust—Christ or the modern Church of Rome? Surely it is better to fall into the hands of God than into the hands of man!

NOTE.—The supposed means of ultimate deliverance from purgatory by indulgences is treated of in chapters xxxvi. and xxxvii.

---

[1] See Littledale's "Plain Reasons, &c.," p. 111.
[2] Heb. ii. 15. [3] Rom. viii. 1. [4] Rom. v. 9. [5] 1 Thess. v. 9, 10.

XXVIII

THE INVOCATION OF SAINTS

Q.—How does the Roman doctrine of venerating departed Saints and asking their prayers differ from the acknowledged privilege of asking the prayers of living friends for temporal or spiritual mercies; is it not included in the "Communion of Saints"?

A.—Romanists by no means teach that they merely ask departed saints to pray for them, nor is their doctrine worthy of being regarded as a portion of the article in the Creed, "I believe in . . . the Communion of Saints." The eighth article in the Creed of Pope Pius IV. reads thus: "I hold that the saints reigning with God are to be venerated and invoked, and that they offer prayers to God for us, and that their relics are to be venerated." This statement slightly differs from the language of the Council of Trent, which describes the saints as "reigning with Christ," and declares that "it is good and useful suppliantly to invoke them, and to have recourse to their prayers, aid, and help for obtaining benefits from God through His Son Jesus Christ" (Sess. xxv.).

These statements involve several questions.

WHO ARE SAINTS ACCORDING TO ROME?—The Roman use of the word "saint" is very different from that in the New Testament. Rome restricts the word to apostles, martyrs, and to those who, having been canonised by the Pope, have left purgatory, and are now supposed to be "reigning with Christ" in glory. But in the New Testament the word always signifies those who are "the faithful in Christ Jesus," whether living or dead (Jude 14, D.). Thus St. Paul addresses his Epistle to those who are "*called to be saints*" (Rom. i.; 1 Cor. i.). "*To all the saints which are in Achaia*" (2 Cor. i. 1). "*To all the saints which are in Ephesus*" (Eph. i. 1; so Phil. i. 1; Col. i. 2, &c.). It is a large and comprehensive word, not the title of a few eminent and notable characters, whom a particular Church has chosen to dignify, but of all who "*love the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity*," and conform their lives to His holy teaching. Rome says that Protestants have no saints since the Reformation, and that we acknowledge many of theirs. The simple fact is that Protestants believe that there are saints in all branches of the Catholic Church, and that there never were so many as since the printing of the Bible and the return to Scriptural and primitive doctrine which took place at the Reformation. They believe in saints, unknown in high quarters, living in alleys and garrets as well as in monasteries, working hard in the sweat

of their brow, as well as in conspicuous positions, who loving and serving Christ are saints now, and at the resurrection will be numbered with "All saints in glory everlasting." It is this magnificent company, "*who have washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb*,"[1] that form the true "Communion of Saints," including the saints of the Old Testament as much as those of the New—not a restricted and technically selected few, chosen frequently because of their services to Rome more than because of holy devotedness and loyalty to Christ. Di Bruno gives a list of saints covering ten pages—a large number of whom, however, belonged to non-Roman Churches; but the library at the British Museum, if turned into a catalogue, would not contain the names of those whom God reckons as saints from the foundation of the world, and with whom, through Christ as their Head,[2] they have membership and fellowship one with another. This communion ever grows in faith and hope and love; nor need we fear to take the consolation of believing that departed saints continue to pray for those whom they have left behind.[3]

ARE THE SAINTS "REIGNING WITH CHRIST"?—These Canonised saints are said to be "reigning with Christ." They have been in Purgatory, and usually, after some fifty years, they are supposed to

[1] Rev. vii. 14, 15, D. [2] Col. ii. 19; 1 John i. 3.
[3] "Destiny of the Creature," by Bishop Ellicott.

have ascended to the Beatific Vision, presumably by the influence of their admirers and friends, and having attained to this exaltation—which cannot be proved—they are then commended to the "veneration" and *invocation* of the Church.

But are any of the saints "NOW REIGNING WITH CHRIST"? The general teaching of Scripture is that souls on their departure enter into the intermediate state of Hades, and remain there until the second coming of Christ, awaiting the resurrection and the judgment. When our Blessed Lord gave up the ghost, He descended into Hades (Acts ii. 27, R.V.), and into that portion of it called Paradise (Luke xxiii. 43, R.V.). He did not ascend into *heaven* (Acts i. 3) until forty days after His resurrection. The parable of Lazarus and Dives represents them as in Hades (Luke xvi. 23, R.V.), and with this agrees the description of the martyrs in Rev. vi. 10, 11, D.: "*How long, O Lord, holy and true, dost Thou not judge and revenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth? And it was said unto them that they should rest yet for a little time, till their fellow-servants, and their brethren* WHO WERE TO BE SLAIN EVEN AS THEY, *should be filled up.*" This is quite contrary to the notion that the saints are "now reigning with Christ," but consistent with the Creed of the undivided Church: "He descended into Hades: The third day He rose again from the dead, He ascended

into heaven . . . From *thence* He shall come to judge the quick and the dead." Those passages which speak of the state of the faithful after death describe their blessedness and joy as consisting chiefly of an increased perception of the presence of Christ. Their "perfect consummation and bliss," their "reigning with Christ," is reserved unto the resurrection of the body and the final judgment. Even the martyrs have to wait in Hades "*until their brethren who are to be slain shall be filled up*," and that number is not yet complete, as every Mission field testifies. This, too, was the opinion of most of the Fathers, agreeing with Tertullian, "The souls go into the unseen place assigned to them by God, and there remain till the resurrection, waiting for the resurrection; *afterwards* receiving again their bodies, and rising perfectly, that is, bodily, even as the Lord also rose again, so will they come into the presence of God." There is not in Scripture any distinction drawn between the present position of apostles, martyrs, and other saints who have died in faith. The very foundation of the Roman doctrine is unsound.

THE SPECIES OF WORSHIP GIVEN TO SAINTS.—To avoid the charge of creature-worship, Rome has devised three orders of veneration—Latreia, worship due to God alone; Douleia, the lowest kind of worship given to saints; and Hyperdouleia, a superior and intermediate worship given to the

Virgin Mary. With the strong expressions in Holy Writ as to worship being due to God alone, the attempt to determine degrees of worship and assign two of them to human creatures is more than questionable. Allowing that some intellectual Romanists may give only such respect and homage to saints as is implied in the use of the word "worship" in relation to earthly magistrates, it is practically impossible for the mass of the poor and ignorant thus to discriminate. They bend the knee to all, they pray to all, for this is the meaning of the word *invoke*: "*They stoned Stephen, invoking and saying, Lord Jesus, receive my spirit.*"[1] How can such exercise the mental effort to discriminate between the prayers and homage given to the saint, the Virgin, the relics, the cross, and to the Saviour and to God? No Church can be justified in placing even her humblest members in such positions of peril, seeing that God has expressly declared, "*I will not give My glory to another, nor My praise to graven things*" (Isa. xlii. 8, D.).

There are only four instances of creature-worship in the Bible, and in each case it was instantly repudiated. See Acts x. 25, 26; Acts xiv. 12–14; Rev. xix. 10; and Rev. xxii. 8, 9. The only verse quoted in defence of creature-worship is Rev. iii. 9, "*To the Angel of the Church of Philadelphia write . . . I will make them to come and adore* (προσκυνήσωσιν)

[1] Acts vii. 58, D.

before thy feet." The passage has no reference to saint-worship. It only foretells that the enemies of the Church of Philadelphia should repent and submit themselves to the Bishop, *bowing before him*, as the word signifies, and seeking to be restored to the fellowship of the Church. Our Lord, being Divine, never refused an act of worship, since it was His due. There was no refusal to the young ruler, but a solemn call that he should consider well to whom he was speaking: nor was it a refusal to Mary Magdalene[1] when He said to her, "*Touch Me not,*" but a warning that she was to recognise His more exalted state after His glorious resurrection. All Scripture restricts worship in any religious sense to the Blessed Trinity.

WHAT DOES "INVOKING" MEAN?—In almost all modern Romish books[2] intended for Protestant readers, it is made to appear that *invoking* the saints simply means *asking them to pray for us*, as we might seek the prayers of an earthly friend, according to the words of St. James (v. 16, D.), "*Pray for one another . . . the continual prayer of a just man availeth much,*" or as the frequent request of St. Paul to his converts, "*Brethren, pray for us*" (2 Thess. iii. 1, D.). But the teaching of Rome goes much further. It treats the word "invoking" in its true sense as *calling upon with a view to obtain some blessing from*

[1] Ryder, Cath. Con., 88.

[2] Such as Di Bruno, Ryder, Bagshawe, and Keenan.

the saint that is invoked. It is no mere "pray for us," but "Do *thou* grant me the aid, help, or blessing, that I need and for which I invoke thee." Their partial representations are not honest. Take the following prayers addressed to St. Joseph in a manual drawn up by Cardinal Vaughan:[1]—

"Ever-Blessed and glorious Joseph, kind and indulgent father, and compassionate friend of all in sorrow! through that bitter grief with which thy heart was saturated when thou didst behold the sufferings of the Infant Saviour, and in prophetic view didst contemplate His most ignominious passion and death, take pity, I beseech thee, on my poverty and necessities, counsel me in my doubts, and console me in all my anxieties. Thou art the good father and protector of orphans, the advocate of the defenceless, the patron of those who are in need and desolation. Do not then disregard the petition of thy poor child; my sins have drawn down upon me the just displeasure of my God, and hence I am surrounded with sorrows. To thee, O loving guardian of the poor neglected family of Nazareth, do I fly for shelter and protection."

"Remember, O most pure spouse of the blessed Virgin Mary, my sweet protector, St. Joseph, that no one ever had recourse to thy protection, implored thy help, or sought thy mediation without obtaining relief. Confiding, therefore, in thy good-

[1] "Who is Joseph?" Burns & Oates, 1d.

ness, I come into thy presence and fervently recommend myself to thy care and protection. Oh, despise not, most loving foster-father of my Redeemer, the petition of thy humble client, but graciously hear and grant it. Amen."

Scores of such direct requests may be gathered from the "Glories of Mary," and other manuals of saints.

INVOCATION OF SAINTS UNKNOWN TO THE FATHERS. —The celebration of the anniversaries of the death of martyrs commenced early in the Christian Church. What St. Paul said in his day continued through the greater part of the first three centuries—"*We are made a spectacle to the world, and to angels and to men. . . . We are made as the filth of the world and are the offscouring of all things unto this day*" (1 Cor. iv. 9–13). Hence the intense devotion and affection to those who sealed their testimony with their blood. Special services were held, and orators spoke of them in all the rhetorical emotion and passion of sympathy, gratitude, and praise, urging their endurance and self-sacrifice for the example and encouragement of the Church at large. It would be no wonder if, under the influence of such love and excitement, expressions should be found in their addresses which might not be justifiable if spoken in calmness and by the light of Scripture. Yet, in spite of this enthusiasm, no examples of saint-worship, or of clear instances of invocation, can be produced in the first

four centuries. The quotations given in Romish books are not always fairly employed by those who quote them, as they imply no more than most Protestants readily allow. Thus the words of St. Augustine are quoted: "Our Lord Jesus Christ yet intercedes for us, all the martyrs who are with Him intercede for us. Nor ever do their intercessions cease until our groanings have passed away." And again St. Jerome is quoted: "If the apostles and martyrs whilst yet in the flesh could pray for others whilst they had still cause for anxiety on their own account, how much more after their crowns, their victories, and their triumphs?"[1] These passages are quoted as if to uphold the cultus and invocation of the saints; but the careful reader will see that there is not the slightest reference to Rome's doctrines in either of them; they contain only the general belief of Christendom that the departed may continue their interest and prayers for those whom they have left behind to battle with the world and sin. The great names of these two Fathers are produced only to mislead the simple, and it is worthy of remark that they belong to the fifth century—a tacit confession that no earlier testimony could be produced.

A greater difficulty remains. There is NO AUTHORITY for supposing that departed saints can *hear the prayers of men upon earth.* It has been well

[1] Ryder's Cath. Con., p. 90.

said that nothing short of a Revelation can prove that the saints in heaven *have the power* to hear the prayers of men on earth."[1] But no such revelation has been given. A Roman apologist[2] quotes, or rather misquotes, Matthew xxii. 30, D., "*Ye shall be as the angels of God in heaven*," but he omits the qualification made by our Lord, "*in the resurrection*"; not *till then* does He say that we shall be as the angels. Nor does the passage quoted in connection with it (Luke xv. 7, 10, D.), "*I say unto you, there shall be joy before the angels of God upon one sinner doing penance*" (more accurately, "that repenteth"),[3] prove that the angels know everything that takes place on earth. They know the immediate incidents of their own ministry, but this does not imply that they communicate their knowledge to the saints.

So far from Scripture supporting the doctrine, the words of Isaiah (lxiii. 16) are plainly against such supposed knowledge of departed saints: "*Doubtless Thou art our Father, though Abraham be ignorant of us, and Israel acknowledge us not*"; on which St. Augustine remarks, "If such great patriarchs as these were ignorant what was done towards the people that descended from them, how can the dead be thought to concern themselves with knowing and furthering the affairs and actions of the living?"[4]

[1] Swete's "England *v.* Rome."

[2] Di Bruno, "Catholic Belief," p. 193.

[3] The Douay translates the original word correctly in Acts v. 31.

[4] *De Curâ pro Mortuis*, c. 13.

And this is confirmed by the fact that there is not a single instance of a petition being offered to a departed saint. There are two striking instances of martyrdom recorded in the Acts—of St. Stephen and St. James—but we never read in Scripture or the Fathers of their being invoked. It is a word restricted in its use to God and to the Saviour. The whole doctrine comes under St. Paul's condemnation as an act of "will-worship"—an intrusion "into things not seen" (Col. ii. 18).

Is it wise, is it loyal, is it safe to attempt to approach God by an unauthorised method when the Son of God Himself, the Lord Jesus Christ, is our One Mediator and Intercessor, and when all prayer and access to God is invited freely through that all-prevailing Name? (Heb. x. 19–24; John xiv. 6, and xvi. 23, 24).

NOTE.—Rome supposes that the saints not only *hear* the prayers, but can read the *thoughts*. Council of Trent, Sess. 25: "They are to be counted impious who say that they (the saints) are not to be invoked in words or *with the mind*" (see Dr. Cumming's *Lectures on "Invocation of Saints,"* p. 10), thus claiming the *Omniscience of Him who searcheth the heart.*

XXIX

MARIOLATRY

Q.—What is the meaning of Mariolatry?

A.—Literally the word Mariolatry means the "worship of Mary." The religious system which it really involves is so serious and extended that it needs special consideration.

In order to give a peculiar honour to the Virgin Mary, Rome has invented a term (hyperdouleia) to signify veneration and worship due to her, which is *above* that (douleia) due to the saints and *inferior* to the highest degree of worship (latreia) which is due to God. Such an artificial distinction fails in practice, as it necessarily must do when the same visible acts are rendered to one as to the other—kneeling, bowing, prostration; when similar services are provided with special indulgences, and when books of devotion inculcate prayer, intercession, and direct requests to Mary which are suitable only to God and Christ. This cult, or worship, of the Virgin Mary has recently advanced by leaps and bounds. In the ancient service books, such as the Missal and the Breviary, the prayers usually only plead the merits

and intercession of Mary—an unscriptural and unauthorised practice, yet far removed from modern invocations. Thus in the service of the mass, second Sunday after Easter, there occurs this plea—"Having received, O Lord, these helps of our salvation, grant, we beseech Thee, that we may be everywhere protected by the patronage of the Blessed Mary, ever Virgin, in veneration of whom we have made these offerings to thy Majesty."

In the BREVIARY there is a distinct advance. The prayers are offered to the Virgin herself, yet still asking only her intercession—"Blessed Mother, Virgin undefiled, glorious Queen of Heaven, intercede for us with the Lord." So a prayer to Mary at the celebration of the mass—"O mother of pity and mercy, most blessed Virgin Mary, I, a miserable and unworthy sinner, flee to thee with my whole heart and affection, and I pray thy sweet pity, that as thou didst stand by thy sweetest Son upon the cross, so thou wouldest vouchsafe of thy clemency to stand by me, a miserable priest, and by all priests who here and in all the holy churches offer HIM this day, that, *aided by thy grace*, we may be enabled to offer a worthy and acceptable VICTIM in the sight of the most high and undivided Trinity." Then in the ROMAN RITUAL prayers are directed to the Virgin for benefits as *her own gifts*, without any reference to her intercession—"Under thy protection we take refuge, Holy Mother of God: despise not our sup-

plications in our necessities, but from all dangers do thou deliver us, O glorious and blessed Virgin."

CANONISED SAINTS.—Turning from the authorised service books to the unrebuked, rather the approved, language of Rome's canonised saints, the practices and expressions are too sad to record save for the purposes of warning, and of guarding the honour due to the Holy Trinity. Thus Bonaventura is honoured as a saint, and on his festival, July 14, the priest offers this prayer in the Missal—"O God, who didst give to Thy people blessed Bonaventura as a minister of eternal salvation, grant that we deserve to have him as our intercessor in heaven, whom we had as our TEACHER on earth." Now what is the teaching of this saint? **He prepared a psalter, the preface of which begins with—"Come unto Mary, all ye that are weary and heavy laden, and she will give you rest."** Then he takes the 150 psalms singly, and so changes them as to address—not God or the Messiah—but the Virgin Mary! *E.g.* the 95th Psalm is thus rendered, "O come, let us sing unto our Lady, let us heartily rejoice in the Virgin that brings us salvation," &c.; the 51st Psalm, "Have mercy upon me, O Lady, who art called the Mother of Mercy; according to thy tender mercy, cleanse me from my iniquities"; the 84th Psalm, "How amiable are thy tabernacles, O Queen of Virtue! how amiable is thy dwelling-place!" After this awful perversion of God's Word, it is not a matter

of wonder that he should treat that magnificent hymn the *Te Deum* with like irreverence—"We praise thee, O Mary, as the Mother of God, we acknowledge thee to be the Virgin. All the earth doth worship thee, the Spouse of the Eternal. All angels and archangels, thrones and principalities, serve thee. To thy glory the angels for ever sing—Holy, holy, holy Mary, Mother of God: both a mother and a virgin. The glorious company of the apostles praise thee, the Mother of the Creator. O lady, save thy people, that we may partake of the inheritance of thy Son, and govern us and guard us for ever. Vouchsafe, O sweet Mary, to keep us now and for ever without sin." The Athanasian Creed also did not escape the "unhallowed parodies" of this canonised saint and TEACHER of the Roman Church.[1]

St. Bernadine of Sienna, also a canonised saint, uses startling language—"All things, even God, are servants of the empire of the Virgin." "All the angelic spirits are the ministers and servants of this glorious Virgin." "To comprise all in a brief sentence, I have no doubt that God granted all the pardons and liberations in the Old Testament on account of His love and reverence for this blessed maid, by which God pre-ordained from eternity that she should, by predestination, be honoured above all His works." Again, "God is subject to the command of Mary." And again, the saint places her

[1] See Vatican edition of Bonaventura's works: similar perversions by the Jesuit Raynaud of Lyons.

virtually above the Holy Ghost, stating in one of his sermons, "I fear not to say that the Virgin has a certain jurisdiction over the flowing of all graces. And because she is the Mother of such a Son of God, who produces the Holy Spirit, therefore all the gifts, graces, and virtues of the Holy Spirit are administered by the hands of HERSELF, to whom she will, when she will, how she will, and in what quantity she will." It will be thought that nothing can exceed this, but there is even a lower depth to which this saint can fall :—"Setting each individual thing one against the other, namely, what things God hath done for man and what things the Blessed Virgin has done for God, you will see that MARY HAS DONE MORE FOR GOD THAN GOD HAS FOR MAN : so that thus, on account of the Blessed Virgin (whom nevertheless He Himself made), GOD IS IN A CERTAIN MANNER UNDER GREATER OBLIGATIONS TO US THAN WE ARE TO HIM."[1] This is the man respecting whom Pope Sixtus IV. issued a Bull extolling the saint, dedicating a new church to his honour, and enrolling him among those whom it is now lawful for Romanists to invoke. Only one additional instance of the writings of a saint shall be given—that of Alphonso Liguori, who was canonised in the year 1839, and whose writings[2] confirm the

[1] See Sermons, Paris, 1636.

[2] His writings were examined previous to his canonisation, and were declared to contain nothing worthy of censure. He was made "doctor" by Pius IX., *i.e.* one of the great divines whose dicta (words) have the highest authority.

language of those already cited. The extracts are from his book, "The Glories of Mary."[1] Liguori allows that God "could grant His graces without the intercession of Mary," but he asserts that "He will not"—that "God has resigned into her hands (if one might say so) His omnipotence to the sphere of grace." "I shall no longer fear your Son justly irritated, since one word from you (Mary) will appease Him." "To sinners who have lost Divine grace, there is no more sun (the symbol of Jesus) for him, but the moon is still on the horizon; let him address himself to Mary." "She is the only refuge of those who have incurred the Divine indignation." "My Queen, thou art my advocate with thy Son, *to whom I dare not have recourse.*" Add this prayer from the same book, "Glories of Mary"—"O Mother of God, Queen of Angels, O hope of men! listen to one who invokes and has recourse to thee. Behold me to-day prostrate at thy feet. I, a miserable slave of hell, dedicate myself to thee as thy perpetual slave, offering myself to serve and honour thee to the utmost of my power during my whole life." Also a prayer of St. Bernard, "We raise our eyes to thee, O Queen of the world. We must appear before our Judge after so many sins. Who shall appease Him? There is no one better able to do it than thou. O lady, who dost love Him so tenderly and art

[1] The book has the approval of Cardinals Wiseman and Manning.

so tenderly loved by Him. Open then, O Mother of Mercy, the ears of thy heart to our sighs and prayers. We fly to thy protection: appease the anger of thy Son by presenting to Him His own merits and restore to us His grace."[1]

This language of canonised saints cannot be wondered at when the words of Pope Pius IX. himself are weighed which he wrote in his Encyclical, A.D. 1849 — "Ye know very well, venerable brethren, that the whole of our confidence is placed in the most Holy Virgin, since God has placed in Mary the fulness of all good, that accordingly we may know *that if there is any hope in us, if any grace, if any salvation, it redounds to us from her*, because such is His will, who hath willed that we should have everything through Mary."

This teaching of canonised doctors and Popes is now taught dogmatically to children in Romish schools and in many families, though it should be said with thankfulness some refuse to do so. The following passages are taken from a "Little Catechism of the Blessed Virgin," by the Marist Brothers. Twelve principal privileges are assigned to Mary: amongst them are the Immaculate Conception; a miraculous and painless delivery; her resurrection three days after her death, and her Assumption, body and soul, into heaven; her coronation as Queen of heaven and earth, and her appointment by Jesus

[1] "Glories of Mary."

Christ to be "the dispenser of all His graces." To the question, "How far should we honour the Blessed Virgin?" the answer is, "By placing her below God, but above all else." Question—"What is meant by continual confidence?" Answer—"It means that we ought to have recourse to Mary at all times and in all places, every day and every hour; because our wants are continual, and God takes pleasure in granting us His graces on all occasions through His Holy Mother." The catechism also contains instructions as to the Feasts of the Blessed Virgin, the use of Holy Scapular ("a small livery worn in honour of the Virgin") and the Holy Rosary ("a set of prayers in honour of the Blessed Virgin"), and closes with prayers to the Virgin, amongst which is the following—"Remember, O most Holy Virgin Mary, that no one ever had recourse to thy protection, implored thy help, or sought thy mediation without obtaining relief. Confiding therefore in thy goodness, behold me a penitent sinner, sighing out my sins before thee, beseeching thee to adopt me for thy child, and to take upon thee the care of my eternal salvation. Despise not, O Mother of Jesus, the petition of thy humble client, but hear and grant my prayer. Amen."

The Flesh of Mary in the Eucharist.—Such is the extravagance to which this novel doctrine is being carried that a Roman writer maintains "a presence of Mary in the Eucharist,"

and that "the blood of the Lord and the flesh of His Virgin Mother are both present in the sacrament. We are much inclined to believe an essential co-presence of Mary in her whole person, with body and soul, under the sacred species."[1] Another writer affirms—"As often as we eat the flesh of Christ in the Eucharist, so often do we in it really eat the flesh of the Blessed Virgin. . . . As then we daily hunger after the flesh of Christ, so too we hunger for that same flesh of the Blessed Virgin that we may drink her virgin endowments and ways and incorporate them in ourselves."[2] So another very popular author (Faber) writes—"There is some portion of the precious blood which once was Mary's own blood and which remains still in our Blessed Lord. . . . At this moment in heaven He retains something which was once His Mother's, and which is possibly visible, as such, to the saints and angels. He vouchsafed at mass to show to St. Ignatius *the very part of the host which had once belonged to the substance of Mary.* It may have a distinct and singular beauty in heaven, where, by His compassion, it may one day be our blessed lot to see it and adore it. But with the exception of this portion of it, the precious blood was a growing thing," &c. Surely visions, ecstasies, and

[1] Oswald, "Dogmat. Mariologie," p. 177.

[2] Cornelius à Lapide on Ecclus. xxiv. 29, quoted by Dr. Pusey in his "Eirenicon," p. 170.

superstition have at last reached their extreme limit; it seems impossible for imagination and invention to proceed further. No wonder that men become unbelievers where such perversions of Christianity are taught.

The question can now be answered—WHAT IS MARIOLATRY? It is little less than the invention of "*another gospel*," revealed neither by apostles nor by an angel from heaven, but an awful superstitious endeavour to represent the life and rank of the Virgin Mary as corresponding and equivalent to the life and rank of our adorable Redeemer, Deity alone excepted. By placing the teaching of Scripture with regard to our Lord and the unfounded claims for the Virgin Mary in parallel columns, the correctness of this solemn statement will be immediately apparent. It will be seen at once that every title and office, with many circumstances in personal history, belonging to Christ exclusively, are attributed to Mary, so that she appears as an equal or rival in the work of man's salvation:—

JESUS CHRIST.	VIRGIN MARY.
"Tempted in all points like as we are, yet without sin" (Heb. iv. 15, D.).	Immaculate, "preserved free from all stain of original sin." —*Papal Decree, Dec.* 8, 1854.
"Foreseeing, he spoke of the resurrection of Christ; for neither was He left in hell (Hades), neither did His flesh see corruption" (Acts ii. 31, D.).	Body of Mary in the grave only three days, and saw no corruption.—*A Legend of the 4th cent. first declared by Rome to be heretical and accepted in 6th cent.*

JESUS CHRIST.	VIRGIN MARY.
"The third day He rose from the dead, He ascended into heaven."—*Ap. Creed.*	"Was raised the third day and taken body and soul to heaven."—*Commemorated in "Feast of the Assumption."*
	"Queen of heaven and earth."
"King of kings and Lord of lords" (1 Tim. vi. 15).	"Exalted above things visible and invisible."—*2nd Council of Nicæa*)—"Above all the orders of angels and saints."—*Encycl. of Pius IX.*
"Far above all principality and power . . . and dominion," &c. (Eph. i. 21, D.).	
"In the Unity of the Godhead there be three persons, of one substance, power, and eternity: the Father, the SON, and the Holy Ghost."—Art. i., *Church of England.* See the *Athanasian Creed.*	Mary is "the complement of the Trinity." "Daughter of God the Father, Mother of God the Son, Spouse of the Holy Spirit, Noble Couch of the whole Trinity." — *Hebdomas Mariana.*
"Head over all things to the Church."—Eph. i. 10 and 22.	Mary is "centre of the whole universe."—*Salazar.*
"That all men may honour the Son, as they honour the Father" (John v. 23, D.).	"Jesus Christ . . . has given her by grace, relatively to His Majesty, all the same rights and privileges which He possesses by nature."—*De Montfort.*

So far we see Rome investing Mary with circumstances of dignity and honour which pertain only to the incarnate Son of God. The following extracts, which claim for Mary a co-equal share with our Blessed Lord in the *salvation of mankind*, can only be read with mingled feelings of sorrow and indignation.

JESUS CHRIST.	VIRGIN MARY.
"God so loved the world as to give His only-begotten Son" (John iii. 16, D.).	"So Mary loved the world that she gave her only-begotten Son."—*Dr. Salazar.*
"Nor is there salvation in any other. For there is no other name under heaven given to men whereby we must be saved" (Acts iv. 12, D.).	"If there is any hope in us if any grace, if any SALVATION, it rebounds to us from HER, because such is His will, who hath willed that we should have everything through Mary."—*Pope Pius IX., Ep. Evangel.*, A.D. 1849.
"Looking on Jesus, the AUTHOR and Finisher of Faith" (Heb. xii. 2, D.).	"AUTHORESS of everlasting salvation."—*Bp. of Alghero.*
"I have trodden the wine-press alone" (Isa. lxiii. 3, D.).	"The Virgin, the associate and co-operatress of the merits of Christ."—*Salazar.*
"No one taketh it (my life) from Me, but I lay it down of Myself" (John x. 18, R.V.).	"The Virgin not only concordant with the Father, gave her Son to the world, but also in conformity with her Son, with *priestly piety offered Him up as a sacrifice for the world.*"—*Dr. Salazar.*
"But He (Christ), when He had offered one sacrifice for sins for ever, sat down on the right hand of God . . . for by one offering He hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified" (Heb. x. 12–18).	
"Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us: for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree" (Gal. iii. 13, D.).	"Co-redemptress of the human race together with her Son, Jesus Christ our Lord. "Co-redeemer" (*passim*).
"There is one God and one Mediator of God and men, the man Christ Jesus" (1 Tim. ii. 5, D.).	"Mediatrix" and "Mediatress" *passim*)

JESUS CHRIST.	VIRGIN MARY.
"For God indeed was in Christ reconciling the world to Himself. . . . For Christ we beseech you, be ye reconciled to God (2 Cor. v. 19, 20, D.).	"Conciliatrix," "Conciliatress," "Reconciless" (*passim*).
"For which thing I thrice besought the Lord (Jesus) that it might depart from me: and He said to me, My grace is *sufficient* for thee" (2 Cor. xii. 8, 9, D.).	"Dispensatrix of grace." "She is the throne of grace, whereof the apostle speaketh."—*Bern. de B.*
"Having therefore a great High Priest, JESUS the Son of God . . . let us go with confidence to the throne of grace, that we may obtain mercy, and find grace in seasonable aid" (Heb. iv. 14–16, D.).	"Dispensatrix of the Divine grace, you save whom you please. To you, then, I commit myself, that the enemy may not destroy me."—*Glories of Mary.*
"Hath an everlasting priesthood, whereby He is able also to save for ever them that come unto God by Himself: always living to make intercession for us" (Heb. vii. 24, 25, D.).	"Having been made by the Lord Queen of heaven and earth, and exalted above all the orders of angels and saints . . . does by her mother's prayers most potently impetrate and find what she seeks, and cannot be frustrated."—*Decree of Pius IX.*
"Amen, amen, I say unto you: if you ask the Father anything in My name, He will give it you. Ask, and you shall receive, that your joy may be full" (John xvi. 23, 24, D.).	"He who finds Mary, finds every good, finds all graces, all virtues; for by her powerful prayers she obtains for him all that is necessary to make him rich in divine grace."—*Glories of Mary.*

It is worthy of special notice that in all the assertions with regard to the dignity of Mary and her

participation in the work of salvation, no appeal is made to Holy Scripture. The opinions quoted are those of men, not of God.

The late Pope Pius IX. called the Virgin Mary "Queen of Heaven and Earth," and wrote: "Let all the sons of the Catholic Church hear these our words, and, with a yet more ardent zeal of piety, religion, and love, continue to *worship*, *invoke*, and *pray* to the most blessed Mother of God, the Virgin Mary, and to flee unto her in all perils, distresses, necessities, and doubtful circumstances." The late Pope, Leo XIII., was never weary of extolling the power of Mary. Each Encyclical urged her worship with increasing zeal. In 1897 he wrote: "We can address Mary with almost the same prayer as God—'Have mercy upon sinners.' For such is the greatness of Mary, so vast the favour wherewith she avails with God, that to one in need of help, not to have recourse to her is to wish to fly without wings." How different from the words of the true Peter, "*Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life*" (John vi. 69, D.).

NOTE.—Rome observes twenty-two festivals in honour of Christ, and forty-two in honour of Mary, that of the Assumption being the greatest and grandest. The month of May is given up to her worship in prayers, masses, indulgences, &c., and also the month of October. Every Saturday is also assigned to her when not preoccupied.

XXX

THE IMMACULATE CONCEPTION

Q.—Has not Rome pronounced a new doctrine respecting the Virgin Mary? What is the doctrine, and what authority is there for it from Scripture and primitive antiquity?

A.—The new dogma, commonly called the Immaculate Conception of the blessed Virgin Mary, was solemnly defined as an article of faith by Pope Pius IX., speaking *ex cathedrâ*, without the authority of a Council, on the 8th of December 1854, in the following terms:—"By the authority of our Lord Jesus Christ, of the blessed apostles Peter and Paul, and by our own authority, we declare, pronounce, and define that the doctrine which holds that the most blessed Virgin Mary, in the first instant of her conception, by a special grace and privilege of Almighty God, in view of the merits of Jesus Christ, the Saviour of mankind, was preserved free from all stain of original sin, has been revealed by God, and therefore is to be firmly and steadfastly believed by all the faithful."

"Wherefore, if any shall presume—which may

God avert—to think in their heart otherwise than has been defined by us, let them know and moreover understand, that they are condemned by their own judgment, that they have made shipwreck as regards the faith, and have fallen away from the unity of the Church."

The plain meaning of this definition is that Mary was born miraculously; that she never had original sin or taint of man's fallen nature; that she never committed actual sin, and that her death was not the result of the law of sin in herself, but the result of the general law of death in humanity—a solitary exception, neither mentioned, nor suggested, nor hinted at, to the law laid down by St. Paul (Rom. v. 12, D.): "*By one man sin entered into this world, and by sin death: and so death passed upon all men, in whom* ALL *have sinned.*"

This dogma had been debated ever since the eleventh century in the Roman Church, sometimes hotly as between the Dominicans and Franciscans in the fourteenth century, and persistently with the advancing growth of Mariolatry. During these centuries the "Living Voice" gave no answer. The Council of Trent did not venture to proclaim it. Now at last it has been defined on the sole authority of one Pope, Pius IX., in order to render complete a false and dangerous theory as to the dignity and work of Mary in the scheme of human salvation.

WHAT SAITH THE SCRIPTURE?—The only passage in the Bible quoted for the Virgin Mary's immaculacy is a wrong translation in the Latin Vulgate of Gen. iii. 15, "*I will put enmities between thee and the woman, and thy seed and her seed: she shall crush thy head,*" &c.; where *she* is incorrect, and should be *he*, referring to Christ, and not to Mary. True, another argument is forced upon the passage,[1] that if Mary had not been immaculate in her conception, there would have been a time when no enmity would have existed, for there would have been a time when she would have been "the slave of the devil," and would first have been "the abode of the devil."[2] Such arguments only show the weakness of the cause that is advocated. St. John the Baptist was "*filled with the Holy Ghost, even from his mother's womb*" (Douay). Will any one say that he was ever "the slave of the devil" or "the abode of the devil"? Such language is extravagant, even if applied to ordinary baptized believers, who are spoken of in the New Testament as "temples of the Holy Ghost" (1 Cor. vi. 19), never as the abodes of the devil; how much more so when it is applied to one whom all Christians believe to have been at least as graciously favoured as St. John the Baptist. But not only is the dogma unsupported by Scrip-

[1] Di Bruno, "Catholic Belief," 202.

[2] "Catholic Belief," 202. Not only is there no foundation in Scripture for such a statement, but it claims the Divine attribute of omnipresence for the evil spirit, which is heretical.

ture, it is contrary to its uniform teaching. St. Paul expressly teaches, "*Death passed unto all men, for that All sinned*" (Rom. v. 12, R.V.); "*We before laid to the charge of Jews and Greeks that they are All under sin;*" "*All have sinned, and fall short of the glory of God*" (Rom. iii. 9, 23); "*In many things we offend all*" (James iii. 2); and again, "*If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves and the truth is not in us*" (1 John i. 8, D.). Many other passages might be given, and in none of them is the Virgin Mary alluded to as an *exception* to the universal taint. Christ only could give the challenge, "*Which of you shall convince Me of sin?*" (John viii. 46, D.); and of Him only is it true that He was "*tempted in all points like as we are, yet without sin*" (Heb. iv. 15, D.). The claim of sinlessness on the part of any child of Adam is profane; it is an encroachment upon the unique dignity of Christ as the Son of Man, who alone is "*holy, innocent, undefiled, and separated from sinners*" (Heb. vii. 26, D.). Mary herself repels the presumptuous claim, "*My spirit hath rejoiced in God my Saviour*" (Luke i. 47, D.).

UNAUTHORISED BY CHRISTIAN ANTIQUITY.[1]—St. Ambrose (A.D. 380) wrote: "Of all that are born of women, the holy Lord Jesus was the *only one* who experienced not the contagion of earthly corruption, by reason of the novelty of His immaculate birth." Pope Gregory the Great (A.D. 600): "For He (Christ)

[1] See for authorities the "Immaculate Conception," by Palmer.

alone was truly born holy." St. Bernard (A.D. 1150), called the last of the Fathers, repudiated the dogma when it arose in the Gallican Church of the twelfth century. A festival was instituted in its honour in the See of Lyons, which St. Bernard strongly condemned. Cardinal Cajetan (A.D. 1530) wrote: "A great multitude of ancient doctors agree in saying that the Blessed Virgin individually *was* conceived in original sin." So Thomas Aquinas (A.D. 1250), called the Angelic Doctor by Romanists, said "The Blessed Virgin contracted original sin." The Councils of Constance and Basle allowed it only to be regarded as a pious opinion. Thus the decree of Pope Pius IX. is contrary to the judgment of the good and great in all ages.

SUMMARY.—(1.) The doctrine contradicts the express Biblical teaching of "Christ alone without sin,"[1] and the teaching of antiquity for eleven centuries. (2.) It supposes the creation of one *sui generis*, neither strictly human nor divine. (3.) It interferes with the reality of the Incarnation, since by this doctrine Christ did not partake of that human nature which He came to redeem. (4.) It takes away from Christ's glory in the miracle of the Incarnation by conferring a portion of it upon Mary. (5.) It is the climax of a monstrous doctrine which ought to have been nipped in the bud — a doctrine which attributes to Mary a more perfect love and

[1] Art. xv. of Church of England.

sympathy towards sinners than to Christ, with a more accessible and powerful mediation than that of the Son of God, and indirectly aims at exalting Mary to an equality with the Incarnate Son of the Highest.

N.B.—Since writing the above, the author has read the erudite essay of the Jesuit Father Harper on "The Immaculate Conception." It is not pleasant reading with its questionable discussions on so sacred a subject. Protestants do well to avoid such questions and to accept Divine teachings "in such wise as they be generally set forth in Holy Scripture" (Art. xvii. Church of England). The conclusions arrived at overthrow all his arguments (p. 399)—"Mary is the Nurse and Mother of Jesus. All Her vast power—the whole omnipotence of Her intercession, as God has willed it in the sweet counsels of His love—*Her solitary grandeur in the Church as the one golden link which unites earth with Heaven*—the dazzling brightness of Her High Throne of Empire—all are Hers, that she may nurse and foster *Jesus in the hearts of men*," &c. The passage stript of its rhapsodical style contradicts the unique functions of God the Son, Who alone by His incarnation unites earth to heaven: and of God the Holy Ghost, "the Lord and Giver of Life," whose Divine office it is to convince the soul of sin and then to impart to it the grace of Christ's redeeming work, according to our Lord's own words: "*He shall glorify Me: because He shall receive of mine and will declare it unto you*" (John xvi. 14, D.) Does it not closely approach to blasphemy thus to attribute to Mary the exclusive functions of the Divine Persons in the Trinity? Would not the Blessed Virgin be the first to repudiate such unscriptural imputations?

XXXI

ROME'S APOLOGY FOR MARIOLATRY.

Q.—In the absence of Scriptural proof and primitive usage, what excuses or apologies do Romanists offer in defence of this system of Mariolatry?

A.—The excuses and reasons assigned by Romanists in support of Mariolatry are most unsatisfactory.

First, They plead that whatever honour and homage they give to Mary terminates in God. But this is the very reasoning used by the heathen in defence of their image- and hero-worship. It is their constant argument that the worship passes from the image, or the subordinate demon, to the Deity they profess to worship. But this line of defence has never absolved them from the charge of idolatry. No worship can rise to God, or terminate in Him, which is contrary to His will and opposed to His commands. The solemn declarations of God and of His Christ in the Old and New Testaments render such homage as is practically given to Mary no less than a presumptuous sin: it is another instance, and a grievous one, of

that "will-worship" which St. Paul condemns.[1] All the difficulties which beset saint- and image-worship apply to the worship of Mary: there is no proof of her capacity to hear prayer, or of her knowledge of the condition and needs of her suppliants, or of her being acquainted with the rites and festivals and services held in her honour. The system requires that Mary should be Omniscient to know all these things, and especially the prayers of her devotees all over the world, and many at the same instant of time, and it requires Omnipotence on her part to answer them; but Omniscience and Omnipotence are incommunicable attributes of the Holy Trinity; they cannot be given to a creature.[2]

Secondly, It is urged that the homage given to Mary follows from her relation and position as "the Mother of God"; that as all men are bidden "*to honour the Son even as they honour the Father*," because of His filial relation to the Father, so a peculiar honour and worship (hyperdouleia) should be given to Mary as "the Mother of God." But all this arises from the misunderstanding of the title "Mother of God," which in itself expresses a great truth, but as popularly used suggests a great error. The title was sanctioned at the General

[1] Coloss. ii. 23, "Which have a show of wisdom in will-worship, &c.

[2] Some of the modes suggested to evade this necessary consequence are singular: one suggests that God tells Mary all the petitions of her votaries, and that she then offers the petitions back to God!

Council of Ephesus (A.D. 431), in order to arrest the doctrine of Nestorius, who taught that there were *two Persons* in Christ, the human and the Divine, distinct and separate, whereas the orthodox view is that "God and Man are one Christ," and the Greek word (theotokos) asserted—not that Mary was the Mother of the Deity in any sense, but, as the word really signified, the *Mother of Him who was God.* The Council had no idea of honouring or exalting Mary—there was no allusion to any such imagination; the only purpose of the word was to declare the ONE Personality of the Incarnate Son. Mary was the true Mother of the flesh, of the human nature of Jesus, and that nature being taken into God formed the ONE Person of the Saviour Christ, and by virtue of this union Mary might be called the "Mother of Him who was God." In the dark ages the expression became perverted, and much of the Divine honour now virtually paid to Mary is due to the ambiguity, or rather to the *perverted* use, of the word. The relation of Mary to our Lord is only that of being the *favoured medium of His human nature*, not like that of the Son to God, as of "*One substance, power, and eternity*" with the everlasting God.

Some apologists, evidently alarmed at the excesses to which this worship of Mary has already attained, and which is still progressing, endeavour to excuse the language employed on the ground of its being

the language of Devotion. They urge that a certain latitude must be given to *devotional* manuals; that hearts will speak according to the depth of their affection to the object loved, and that these utterances must not be judged by the more balanced language of discretion and dogma. There is a truth in this. The prayers and devotions of the emotional will differ from those of the more calm and sober-minded. Extempore prayers will take a larger and freer scope than those compiled, weighed, and prepared for the use of services and set occasions. But the prayers which most offend the reverent and the thoughtful in this homage to Mary are compiled and printed with the declaration that they have passed Rome's censorship. Such books as "The Glories of Mary" and "The New Month of Mary" have the imprimatur of archbishops, and the writings of canonised saints have a quasi-authority; if the Roman Pontiff *disapproved* of them he could stop their circulation instantly. Laserre's French translation of the New Testament was soon placed on the Index and its sale suspended, though at first sanctioned by the Archbishop of Paris and by the Pope. In not exercising this power over the devotional manuals and services in honour of Mary, the Pope virtually gives his approval to these extravagances, and the evil spreads which ought to be forbidden. The apology, therefore, is of no worth; it only compromises the infallibility of the

Pope and exposes the emptiness of Rome's claim to be a "Living Voice."

A Fourth excuse, painful from the slight which it casts upon the infinite love of our Lord to sinners, is made by representing the Son of God, since His ascension, as changed in His regard to those for whom He died. Many Romanists represent Him as if He were no longer the same in His interest and affection towards mankind. They affirm that the Virgin Mother is more "in touch" with our sorrows, more affected by our temptations and sufferings, more anxious about our salvation; that her love is more intense and tender; yea, that she is more *willing* and more *able* to assist the sinner than the great High Priest who laid down His life of His own free will for man's redemption. Thus Bernardinus de Bustis, a great saint, writes: "Whereas God has justice and mercy, He retained justice to Himself and granted mercy to His Mother; and thus if any one feels himself aggrieved in the court of God's justice, let him appeal to the court of mercy of His Mother." "Oh, most powerful, because most faithful of God's creatures! I presume to approach thee with a *lively sentiment of my own unworthiness to address God*, and with a *strong conviction in the efficacy* of thy *intercession with Jesus*, thy Divine Son, who has placed in thy hands all power and strength."[1] Still more plainly and awfully is

[1] "The New Month of Mary."

this expressed in the following hymn, used in Paris at the Festival of the Assumption: "Vouchsafe, Mary, on this day to hear our sighs and record our desires. Vouchsafe, Mary, on this day to receive our incense, our love. *Of thy Heavenly Husband calm the rage.* Let Him show Himself kind to all those that are thine. *Of thy Heavenly Husband calm the rage.* Let His heart be softened towards us."[1] The following words[2] are said to have been withdrawn, but they express a very general feeling among Romanists, and testify to the mind of this eminent writer on the subject: "We are very unworthy to draw near unto Jesus, and He *has a right to repulse us because of His justice, since, having entered into the feelings of His Father from the time of His blessed Resurrection, He finds Himself in the same disposition with the Father towards sinners, i.e. to reject them: so that the difficulty is to induce Him to exchange the office of Judge for that of Advocate,* and of a Judge to make Him a suppliant. Now this is what the saints effect, and especially the most Blessed Virgin."[3]

[1] Tyler, Tr. ix. 8.

[2] M. Olier, the founder of the Seminary of St. Sulpice.

[3] The writer found this feeling prevailing strongly among his Roman Catholic parishioners. Speaking to a highly-educated French lady, the widow of an English officer, in a great sorrow, he mentioned the comfort arising from the knowledge of the Lord Jesus as Himself made perfect through suffering, and touched with the feeling of our infirmities and griefs. She looked at him with blank astonishment, and then, trembling, said words to this effect: "I thought that when Jesus returned to the glory of His

To any one who can say with the Psalmist, "MY HEART STANDETH IN AWE OF THY WORD," such misrepresentations of Christ—*i.e.* of God—are simply appalling. So far is God from repelling us, that His Word is full of invitation and promise to every repentant sinner. That Word tells us that "*God is love*"; that the "*Father Himself loveth you*"; that "*The God of love shall be with you;*" that "*In this is charity; not as if we have loved God, but because He first loved us, and sent His Son a propitiation for our sins*"; and, "*By this hath appeared the charity of God to us, because God hath sent His only-begotten Son into the world, that we might live through Him*" (1 John iv. 9, 10, D.). And as Jesus Christ is the only sacrifice and propitiation, so He is the ONLY and the all-sufficient Mediator. "*If any man sin, we have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous, and He is the propitiation for our sin.*" "*I am the Way: no man cometh unto the Father but by* ME." "*He ever liveth to make intercession for us,*" and "*Him the Father heareth always.*" "*I will not leave you orphans; I will come to you.*" "*Behold, I am with you always to the end of the ages.*"

Father He was absorbed in the Deity, and had no longer the same feelings towards us as when on earth. I do not presume to speak to Him—I look to the saints and to Mary to mediate for me." It was a discovery to the writer, but he found this to be the general idea. No wonder that the teaching and grace of the Incarnation being virtually lost, Romanists should seek out other modes of propitiation and solace.

Let devout Romanists ask themselves whether it is possible that the love of a creature can surpass the love of God the Son, who took our nature with such humility, leaving the glory and worship of the angels for the taunts and contradiction of sinners, and for the ignominy of the cross! Shall we dare to compare the love of Mary, who received honour and privilege from the incarnation, with the love of Him whose soul was so straitened under the load of our sins that His agony brought down great drops of blood? Can we compare her tenderness with His who wept at the grave of Lazarus and over Jerusalem, the city that rejected and condemned Him to a cruel death? To speak of the love of Mary as greater than the love of Jesus—of her interest in our salvation as exceeding His, or at all corresponding to His—is treachery, and could only arise from an utter and inexcusable neglect of the Word of God.

XXXII

SAFEGUARDS AGAINST MARIOLATRY

Q.—What are the safeguards against this Mariolatry?

A.—The only remedy against an aggressive error is the clearer and more definite apprehension of truth. No one is in danger of Mariolatry who studies the life, character, and redeeming work of the Lord Jesus Christ by the light of Holy Scripture. Look at the Lord Jesus as the Son of Man—not the Son of a Man, but the Son of Man—taking the *whole* of our human nature—the manliness and vigorous virtues of the man, the tender graces and gentleness of the woman. His perfect manliness drew men to him—men of all ranks; the apostles; the seventy disciples; Luke, the physician; Barnabas, the man of landed property; Saul, the profound scholar—all recognised a MAN in Christ unique in superiority of teaching, judgment, endurance, and self-sacrifice over other men. So His perfect *tenderness* drew the women to Him. They followed Him from Galilee and ministered unto Him; they brought their sick to Him for healing, their babes for blessing, themselves for instruction

and consolation, their sins for forgiveness. They felt His feminine powers of sympathy, and refinement, and purity, and sweetness, which won their confidences, and made even the lost women of the street pass Mary by to seek One who penetrated into their temptations and uttered no harsh words of condemnation, but let them wash His feet with tears even as He washed their souls from foulness and endued them with somewhat of His own purity and strength. The men and women who understand the fulness of that title which He repeated beyond all others—"Son of Man"—never turn to Pope or Virgin Mother. They have found the true Friend of sinners—the only one who is "*full of grace and truth*," and of whose "*fulness they may all receive.*" They believe in the humanity of Jesus as well as in His Deity, and they believe, they experience, they know, that He is *unchanged* in His feeling, His compassion, His love towards mankind—whether saints or sinners. The Word of God declares that "Jesus Christ (is) the *same yesterday, to-day, and* FOR EVER" (Heb. xiii. 8). Yes, "AND FOR EVER"! Will any question it? Consider that our adorable Mediator has given us two manifestations of this truth after His ascension, as if to guard His Church from the possibility of error. St. Stephen, amid the fury of those who martyred him, said, "*I see the heavens opened, and the Son of Man standing at the right hand of God. . . . And they stoned Stephen, invoking and*

saying, Lord Jesus, receive my spirit" (Acts vii. 55, 58, D.). Thus the Saviour appeared standing to succour and comfort the deacon, and Stephen died in peace, invoking—not Mary or Joseph—but Jesus ONLY.

The other recorded instance is no less remarkable. It was on that journey to Damascus when Saul was going with warrants to apprehend the Christian converts, men and women, and consign them to prison. The Lord Jesus knew their sorrows, the bitter trials and discouragements that were coming upon the Church "*which He had purchased with His own blood.*" He felt the anguish *personally, as if it were His own.* His startling, conscience-piercing question was, "*Saul, Saul, why dost thou persecute* ME?" He is the Head, His people the members, and that relationship, that union, implies a necessity, an obligation, in which Christ glories, to feel for each suffering soul and to provide it with grace in its time of need. Saul was persecuting Jesus in persecuting these disciples at Damascus. The Lord interposed to save them, and at the same time converted the foe into an apostle. Thus did our Lord make it known for ever that He is the same Jesus, accessible at all times, our advocate with the Father, and in His ascension glory touched, *as ever*, with the feeling of our infirmities.

If devotion to Mary is so essential to salvation, how could it be that God in His last and final revelation of Himself should be so silent about it?

How could St. Paul say that he had *kept back nothing profitable* to his Ephesian presbyters?[1] How could St. John say respecting his Gospel, "*These are written, that you may believe that Jesus is the Son of God, and that, believing, you may have* LIFE *in His name,*"[2] if that life came by any other channel? In the whole Bible there is no single act, no single word, nothing which men by implication can force to sanction any prayer or religious invocation of any kind to any other than to God alone, or any reliance whatever in the mediation or intercession of any being in the unseen world save only our Lord Jesus Christ.

Mariolatry impugns the veracity and love of God.

[1] Acts xx. 20. [2] John xx. 31, D.

XXXIII

HOW PROTESTANTS REGARD THE VIRGIN MARY

Q.—What are the views and feelings of Protestants upon the subject of the regard due to the Virgin Mary?

A.—This question is of great importance, as there is probably some misunderstanding, and frequently much ignorance, on the part of Romanists as to the esteem felt by Protestants for her whom they in all generations call "Blessed." Thus a Catechism largely circulated[1] charges Protestants with speaking of her as "an ordinary woman," and then says of them, "We pity them—we tremble for them. An archangel, bearing the words of the Adorable Trinity upon his lips, tells them they are blasphemers of the saints of God. They utter a falsehood . . . in the very face of God Himself." It then concludes, "that Protestants, as such, belong not to the true people of God. They usually glory in contemning the Blessed Virgin." Again, "Every insult you offer to the Mother is an insult to the Son"; and closes with what is intended to be an

[1] Keenan's "Controversial Catechism," p. 141.

alarming threat—"Beware lest she make against *you* the dreadful appeal made by the souls of the martyrs" (Rev. vi. 10), "How long, O Lord, holy and true, dost Thou not judge and revenge our blood (our dignity and honour) on them that dwell on the earth?" The threat is as harmless as the accusation. Should there be any individuals who seem to speak or write disparagingly of the Virgin, the great guilt lies at the door of Rome, whose extravagant claims have alone produced language that can be regarded as slighting or unworthy, according to the true maxim that "extremes beget extremes." Far different is the experience of a Roman priest who has recently joined the Church of Ireland. Writing to his former flock he states: "There is no truth in the rumours so much believed amongst those who do not take the trouble to inquire, that the Protestant Church despises the Blessed Virgin. That she was the medium of the Incarnation is expressed in the Creeds repeated by Protestants. And her song, 'My soul doth magnify the Lord,' is sung by them on Sunday evenings, as directed in their Prayer Book. This song is, you know, in the Breviary. These prayers are in Latin in the one Church and in the language which the people know in the other"; and then quotes St. Paul (1 Cor. xiv.) in approval of the use of the vernacular.

Protestants weigh carefully every word in Holy

Scripture relating to the Virgin Mary. Take the words of the angel: "*Hail, thou that art highly favoured; the Lord is with thee.*" The word "*Hail*" was the common form of salutation among the Jews —Judas used it in betraying Christ—so the words of the angel are not a prayer, but a salutation: "*Highly favoured*" or "endued with grace" (R.V.)—the same word is applied by St. Paul to his Ephesian converts (Eph. i. 6): "*The Lord is with thee*"—a statement or promise made *repeatedly to the* saints of God. Mary realised the privilege and honour to be conferred upon her, and in her song of praise did not hesitate to express it—"*For behold from henceforth all generations shall call me blessed.*" Again, the language employed was in common use. "*Blessed*" is applied to persons of different degrees of piety—*e.g.* to Jael (Judges v. 24, R.V.) for her patriotic deed, as reckoned in those times—"*Blessed above women shall Jael be*"; to every "*man whose sins are forgiven*" (Ps. xxxii. 1, 2); and as pronounced by our Lord to seven different characters in the Beatitudes (Matt. v. 3–10); Rome gives the title to Peter and others. There is nothing, therefore, unusual about the language of the angel to Mary, or of Mary respecting herself. Simpler or more measured terms could not have been employed; one almost marvels at their sublime simplicity and freedom from any aiming at effect. Would that the Churches had always followed their restrained

and reverent dignity! From what exaggeration and superstition they would have been spared!

Doubtless the blessedness and the grace given to Mary were given richly in proportion to the special design and object of the Divine choice.[1] Mary was to be the medium of the "*Word being made flesh*," of the "taking of the Manhood into God" (Athanasian Creed), and this presupposes God's special choice and preparation, that by the Holy's Spirit's sanctifying grace she should be the most perfect of her sex since Eve, the true woman in piety, modesty, faith, sanctity, and humility. All this we discern in the propriety of the Divine choice and in the suggestiveness of the Gospel record. She was pre-eminent in Piety, having so meditated upon God's Word as to be filled with an expectation of the Messiah; in Modesty, as the whole manner of the interview with the angel testifies and her retiring disposition ever afterwards; in Faith, believing the promises to Israel and the power of God to accomplish His declared will and purpose—"*Behold, the handmaid of the Lord: be it unto me according to Thy word*"; in Holiness and Purity, yet not immaculate or sinless, rejoicing with Simeon and Anna in "that which should be born of her," as bringing a salvation and redemption in which

[1] The salutations of the angel and of Elizabeth imply this. The "Blessed" of Elizabeth (*eulogemene*) is fuller than (*makarios*) the word more commonly employed.

she too could rejoice as well as they, and not ignoring the rite of purification with other mothers of her race; in Humility, never regarding herself as conferring a blessing upon the world—no thought of what the world would be without her will, as is strangely represented in some Romish books—no thought of dignity and honour as due to herself, only regarding herself as the recipient of a privilege beyond all estimate, and of which she felt herself unworthy. Thus regarded, Protestants love and reverence her, because of God's choice of her, because of the lofty privilege bestowed upon her, because of the exquisite graces of her character. They see her not as the author or giver of salvation, but as the chosen vessel through whom God's love in Christ Jesus should be manifested to the world.

The question will be more fully understood by considering the RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MARY AND THE LORD JESUS. The earthly life of our Redeemer is divided into two distinct periods. The first consists of the thirty years in which He dwelt at Nazareth. That was a time of perfect filial obedience and filial love on His part. We read that He was *subject* to Mary and Joseph (Luke ii. 51). "*He advanced in wisdom and stature, and in favour with God and men*" (ver. 52). He wrought at the trade of Joseph as a "carpenter" (Mark vi. 3). He was to be perfect man, that He might sympathise with us in all our trials and toils (Heb. ii. 14, D.)

that His earthly life might be a pattern for our own (1 Peter ii. 21, D.). It was a sacred and wonderful home! "In the world, and yet not of it," might be said of it as of the Lord Himself.

It was a home life which all Christians would do well to consider and imitate, specially the members of the Church of Rome. It was a home saturated with the knowledge of the Word of God. Mary had studied that Word so that its language formed the natural expression for her song of praise—the Magnificat. She taught that Word to the Holy Child, so that He was acquainted with the whole volume, and in His ministry He quoted from every book of the Old Testament, six of minor importance excepted. The Bible was not picked up in "fragments," but was searched, studied, pondered over by the holy family in its connection, fulness, and completeness. Let Romanists imitate Mary in the education of their children in this respect, and show due honour and obedience to the written teachings of the Holy Spirit. At the same time, with true human growth in Jesus, there was something throughout that home life at Nazareth beyond the penetration of Mary and of Joseph. The Virgin knew that she was to be the mother of Him who was to be the Messiah, but the Jews did not expect that the Messiah would be God Incarnate. Mary, like Simeon and Anna and other saintly Israelites, expected "redemption" from this wonderfully-born "Son of the Highest,"

yet there was a certain mystery about this Jesus of which she could not talk to others, manifested at that first Passover visit to Jerusalem—a distance, an unfathomed depth, which caused her again and again "*to ponder these things in her heart.*" Thus the years passed in love, obedience, industry, piety, and study of God's Word, in quiet peace and happiness, not altogether cloudless, for there hung over Mary the knowledge that something was to happen that she did not yet understand, save that in that unknown future *a sword should pierce her own soul* (Luke ii. 35, D.).

The second period.—At the age of thirty the Lord Jesus left that home at Nazareth to revisit it but once, and that under entirely different circumstances.[1] Meantime St. John the Baptist had announced Christ's advent, and He responded by going to him for that baptism which would divide the history of His future from the past, and consecrate Him to the work for which He became Incarnate. The ministry of man's reconciliation with the Father through the Divine Son now begins. There is a period of teaching and miracles, a calling out of disciples, who, under His instruction, should grow into the knowledge of Christ's mission for atonement, and afterwards proclaim Him to mankind as "*the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world.*" In this redeeming work the Virgin

[1] See Luke iv. 16, D.

Mother cannot participate; it is a realm in which she had no place. Accordingly the change in our Lord's manner towards her is distinct and clear. Communications with her virtually cease. During this ministry she is only mentioned at the marriage in Cana of Galilee and at the cross. At Cana there is a distance towards her which cannot be mistaken. He knew the approaching need without her information. He knew "*what He Himself would do*" without her suggestion; therefore He places her on one side, with dignity, not unkindness, from the nature of the ministry on which He had now entered. "*He must tread the wine-press alone;*" hence those words, "*What have I to do with thee? Mine hour is not yet come*" (John ii. 4). The same dignified distance is observed on the two occasions where reference is made by the bystanders to His mother. Christ answers, "Who is My mother and My brethren? And stretching forth His hand towards His disciples, He said, Behold My Mother and My brethren: for whosoever shall do the will of My Father who is in heaven, he is My brother, and sister, and mother" (Matt. xii. 47-50, D.). And again, "*When a certain woman from the crowd said to Him, Blessed is the womb that bare Thee and the paps that gave Thee suck,*" Christ answered, "*Yea, rather, blessed are they who hear the Word of God and keep it*" (Luke xi. 27, D.). And at the cross, when words of personal affection, relationship, and recognition might have been expected, His thoughtfulness

indeed to her is manifested, but the same awful distance is maintained: "*Woman* (not mother), *behold thy son: after that He saith to the disciple, Behold thy mother*" (John xix. 26, 27, D.). With this inspired record of Christ's bearing towards Mary the silence of the rest of Scripture coincides. Her name is only *once* mentioned or alluded to after the Gospels, viz., in Acts i. 14, on the return of the disciples from Olivet to the upper room, where they met together for prayer "*with the women and Mary the mother of Jesus and His brethren.*" She retires into the home of St. John, and no further mention is made of her in Holy Writ. St. Paul assured the Ephesian elders, "*I have kept back nothing that was profitable to you, but have preached it to you. . . . I have not been wanting to declare to you all the counsel of God*" (Acts xx. 20, 27, D.); yet he never alludes to Mary in his Epistle to that Church, or to any other. There is no mention of her in the two Epistles of St. Peter, in one of which he specially dwells upon matters important for them to remember after his decease (2 Peter i. 12, 15). The Epistles of St. John, in whose home she lived and died, and who must have known the Saviour's mind, are silent respecting her. In the Apocalypse, where some glimpses are given of the heavenlies, Mary is not seen! Is there not a Divine purpose, a *prophetic significance* in all this? Who has grasped it rightly? Surely those who believe that her modesty, humility,

refinement, and spiritual graces willed not to be disturbed by acts of human notoriety, much less by a worship which in its extravagance imperils the glory of the Eternal Trinity, and charges the mediatorial work of Christ with insufficiency. Surely those Protestant Catholics who love and reverence the Virgin Mother, who through the ages esteem her "Blessed," and strive to imitate her virtues and her faith.

[The early Fathers gave no sanction to the worship of the Virgin. Epiphanius (4th Century) says, "Mary's body was holy indeed, but she was not a deity. She was a virgin, too and honoured, but not given to us to worship. . . . So He (our Lord) called her "woman" as if prophetically, because of the heresies and schisms which were to come upon the earth, lest anyone, through excessive admiration for that holy Virgin, should fall into the silly nonsense of that heresy."]

XXXIV

THE INVOCATION OF ANGELS

Q.—Is there any authority for the Roman doctrine of the Invocation of Angels?

A.—The doctrine is thus stated in the Catechism of the Council of Trent: "Their intercession (that of angels) is to be invoked because they always see God, and most willingly undertake the advocacy of our salvation assigned to them." It is evident that the refutation already given of the invocation of saints applies equally to the "invocation of angels." There is the same fundamental objection that invocation is *restricted* in the Bible, and, in the very nature of religious worship, to God the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost: the same *silence* in Holy Scripture as to worship being ever offered to them, or any request being made to them or their aid; the same *resistance* on the part of the Fathers to the introduction of the doctrine. The extreme straits to which Roman defenders are reduced may be judged of by the strange and sad perversion of the texts of Scripture which they bring forward. Thus in Keenan's "Controversial

Catechism"[1] we read that St. John "*fell down to adore before the feet of the angel*" (Apoc. xxii. 8., D.), omitting the angel's reply (given in the Douay as well as in the Authorised Version), "*See thou do it* NOT, *for I am thy fellow-servant*," &c. (ver. 9). Another quotation is given from Apoc. i. 4, "*Grace be unto you, and peace from Him Who is, and Who was, and Who is to come, and from the seven spirits which are before His throne, and from Jesus Christ*," &c. Here the writer supposes that the *seven spirits* were seven angels. But leading commentators believe that by the seven spirits we are to understand the third Person in the Blessed Trinity, *i.e.* the Holy Ghost. "The *septenary* number" (says Augustine) "is consecrated to the Holy Ghost in Scripture, and is recognised as such by the Church. And" (as is added by Bede here) "the One Spirit is here characterised as *sevenfold*, because in the One Spirit is all fulness and perfection."[2] The greater number of texts quoted by Roman writers only confirm the view taken by Protestants, that the angels "*are ministering spirits sent forth to do service for the sake of them that shall inherit salvation*" (Heb. i. 14, R.V.), but they contain no suggestion that they ought to be worshipped or invoked.

[1] Last edition, Burns & Oates, 1869, p. 150. Father Keenan clearly assumes that Romanists do not read the Bible—but Protestants do.

[2] Wordsworth *in loco*; also because of His sevenfold gifts, Isa. xi. 2, 3.

Reference is sometimes made to the passages in Genesis where Abraham met the three angels under the oaks at Mamre and "*bowed himself before them*" (Gen. xviii. 1, R.V.), and to the narrative of Jacob wrestling with the angel. But in each instance there is reason to believe that there was a theophany or manifestation of the Divine Presence, a harbinger of that incarnation which was to take place in the fulness of time. Many Romanists agree with the Fathers and Protestants generally in this interpretation. That Abraham "*bowed himself*" before the angels was an act of courtesy, not of worship, his usual dignified behaviour towards strangers, for thus "*he bowed himself before the children of Heth*" (Gen. xxiii. 9 and 12). When two of the angels passed on to Sodom, then Abraham recognised the Divinity of the One who remained, and worshipped Him, not as angel, but as the Lord (Jehovah). So Jacob honoured the angel who wrestled with him, not as a created being, but as the manifestation of God, and said, "*I have seen God face to face and my life is preserved*" (Gen. xxxii. 30), and called the place "Peniel." It should be noticed in all these instances that the angels were present, visible, tangible, and audible—conditions which have no counterpart in the present economy of the Church.

As to the judgment of the Fathers, it is well known that certain heretics held the doctrine, and

were condemned by the early Church and stigmatised as "The Angelicals." The Council of Laodicea (A.D. 360) forbids Christians to "forsake the Church of God and go away and call on (invoke) the names of angels." St. Chrysostom writes indignantly: "The devil it was who introduced the worship of angels. . . . Though it be an angel, though an archangel, though they be cherubim, endure it not"—adding a reason which deserves to be specially regarded, "For these powers themselves will not receive, but reject it when they see the Lord dishonoured." His words also upon that striking verse (Col. ii. 18, R.V.) are to be noticed. Indeed the passage seems to have been indited by the Holy Ghost in prophetic foresight of what has actually happened in the Roman Church—"*Let no man rob you of your prize by a voluntary humility and* worshipping of angels." This St. Chrysostom applies to the voluntary (*self*-willed) humility "of certain who say that we must not approach God through the mediation of Christ, but through that of angels, the former being too great a thing for us to seek." How often is the same empty reason given by Romanists for preferring the intercession of saints, angels, and specially of the Virgin Mary, to that of our Lord! In contrast with this doctrine, which offends against the sympathy, the love, and the glory of Christ, how sober and Scriptural is the positive teaching of Protestants as unfolded in the Collect for St. Michael

and All Angels—"O everlasting God, who hast ordained and constituted the services of angels and men in a wonderful order: mercifully grant that as Thy holy angels alway do Thee service in heaven, so *by Thy appointment* they may succour and defend us on earth.—Through Jesus Christ our Lord." Amen.

[Jerome (A.D. 346—420) says: "Not only do we not worship relics, but not even . . . angels nor archangels, cherubim nor seraphim, nor any name that is named in this world or in the world to come."

Athanasius (A.D. 296—373) says: "It is God's part only to be worshipped, and of this the angels are not unaware, for they, though excelling in glory, are nevertheless all creatures, and are not in the number of those who should be adored, but in that of those who adore the Lord." Orat. III., 2. Against the Arians.]

XXXV

THE VENERATION OF IMAGES AND RELICS

Q.—Is there any truth in the charge that Romanists worship or adore Images and Relics so as to be guilty of idolatry?—a charge which many distinctly repudiate.

A.—If any Romanists affirm that they do not worship or adore images and relics, their word ought thankfully to be believed so far as *regards themselves personally.* Exaggeration is a species of untruthfulness which ought to be honourably avoided. The question is, What do the authoritative documents of Rome say upon the subject, those articles of the faith which bind all Romanists alike? The ninth article of the Creed of Pope Pius IV. runs thus: "I most firmly assert that the images of Christ, of the ever-Virgin Mother of God, and of the other saints, are to be had and retained, and that due honour and veneration are to be rendered to them." And again, "It is lawful to have images in a church, and to pay them honour and respect, as the honour which is paid to them is referred to their prototypes" (*Cat. Council of Trent*).

The language is undoubtedly vague, and Roman priests in England who desire to gain converts take care to present the doctrine and its practice in the most innocent light. Thus Di Bruno and other writers compare this veneration of images and relics to "the token of affection towards our parents if we were to kiss the likeness of a dear father or mother." Di Bruno mentions the well-known custom: "At the House of Lords it is a customary mark of respect to her most gracious Majesty the Queen to bow before her *chair* of state, even though it be empty."[1] But these illustrations fail as regards any true parallel. No one falls prostrate before the chair, or the portrait, or says prayers before it to venerate, much less to adore it. Would indeed that the veneration in the Tridentine language meant no more. But to ascertain what it *does* mean we must turn to the accredited doctors and the service-books that we may learn the meaning accepted by the Roman Church. Thomas Aquinas is a canonised saint, to whom prayer is specially offered on March 7 of each year. Bonaventura is another canonised saint, whom Pope Sixtus IV. declared "to have so written on divine subjects that the Holy Spirit seems to have spoken in Him."

Comparing the Roman doctrine maintained by these eminent saints and by Bellarmine, the great Roman controversialist, and placing the interpreta-

[1] "Catholic Belief," p. 208.

tion as represented by Cardinal Wiseman for English ears between these great writers and the authorised Roman service-books, a certain marked difference is perceptible, which needs to be accounted for:—

ST. AQUINAS.

"To the image the same worship is due which is due to the person of which it is the image. The cross and the image of Christ must be worshipped with the self-same supreme worship (latria) with which Christ Himself is adored."

ST. BONAVENTURA.

"We pay the same reverence, and we ought to pay the same reverence, to the image of the Blessed Virgin as we pay to the Virgin herself, and so of the other saints. Therefore, the same reverence is paid to the image of Christ as to Christ Himself; but the honour of supreme divine worship (latria) is paid to Christ, therefore it ought to be paid to His image."

BELLARMINE supports the following view:—

"That images are to be worshipped both in themselves and on their own account, but yet with a worship inferior to what is due to the original being, and proportionate to the relation which the image bears to that original; and in some limited sense they (the original being and the image) are *identifiable*."

DR. WISEMAN, 1837.

"If I stood before the image of any whom I had loved and lost, fixed in veneration and affection, no one would surely say that I was superstitious or idolatrous in its regard. *Such is precisely all* that the Catholic is taught to believe regarding images or pictures set up in churches."

Roman Ritual of Present Day.

ROMAN BREVIARY.

"Hail! O thou Cross! our only hope! To the pious do thou multiply grace, and for the guilty blot out their sins. O thou Cross, do thou save the present congregation assembled for thy praise!

"The King is exalted to the sky, while the noble trophy of the Cross is adored by all the worshippers of Christ for ever."

ROMAN PONTIFICAL.

"Latria is due to the Cross."

ROMAN MISSAL.

Adoration of the Cross.

"The priest at the middle of the altar uncovers the Cross and says, 'Behold the wood of the Cross. Come, let us adore.' . . . Then the clergy, and then the laity, two and two, approach, and kneeling thrice, adore the Cross."

It is painful to have to point out these discrepancies. A Cardinal could not be ignorant of the teaching of the great doctors of his Church, nor as a priest could he forget the service-books which he used. A special pleader may be excused for presenting his cause as plausibly as possible, but he is not allowed to ignore or pervert evidence.

IDOLATRY A MATTER OF FACT.—But the question of idolatry—of honour paid to the image *as such*—is not a matter of the opinion of Roman controversialists; it is a matter of FACT. Special images of the *same* saint are venerated and favoured as more powerful than others. Thus there is a black image of the Virgin Mary at Montserrat in Spain with this inscription: "Our Lady of Montserrat, declared Patroness of Catalonia on 14th July 1881, crowned canonically by his Holiness Leo XIII. the 11th of September 1881." Here it is distinctly stated that the present Pope crowned canonically that black wooden image as patroness of the large province of Catalonia. It is not the Virgin who is crowned, but the particular manifestation of the Virgin in this black image which is said to have been crowned by the present Pope. Some 100,000 devotees go and worship it as more likely to bestow healing and other benefits than other images of the Virgin. People in multitudes toil up the steep ascent and come long distances, although they have images of the Virgin in their own hamlets in every

church. It is unquestionable that a special particular worship is given to that image. Why do they go to Montserrat? Surely because their ordinary image would not do. They could not be so confident of an answer to prayer at any other image. It is the image which gives the security; the people give special worship because they believe that special miraculous powers belong to *this particular image*. What is this but idolatry?

ROME'S EXPLANATION.—The explanation, or rather defence, given by the Council of Trent and by many of their doctors, is that the worship is "relative," that the honour paid to the images is "referred to the prototypes which they represent." But this does not really distinguish Rome's mode of worship from the worship of the "Gentiles" (the heathen) who place their hope in idols. No heathen, except the most ignorant and degraded, worship the material of the idol, silver or gold, wood or stone. The educated amongst them always refer their worship to the prototype—to the god in whose honour the image has been made. They would use the very language of the Roman apologists—"that the movement of the soul of the worshipper does not stay in the image, but passes on to that of which it is the image."[1] This is evident from the writings of the heathen and from the instance of Baal's prophets on

[1] Ryder, Cath. Cont. 114, where the differences amongst Roman authorities is candidly admitted.

Mount Carmel, who cried to Baal, not as to the idol which they worshipped at other times in his temple, but as within hearing of their supplications. So the distinction which Rome attempts to draw between the idol-worship of the heathen and the image-worship defended by her greatest saints and practised in her churches does not hold good. In the second commandment, be it remembered, God does not only forbid the worship of false gods, but the *false worship of the true*—the worshipping of Himself in a way which He does not prescribe and of which He emphatically disapproves. When Aaron made the golden calf, there was no intention of introducing a new deity for their adoration. They only wanted some visible centre, some visible emblem, some medium by which they could realise God present to themselves, after the manner of the Egyptians. So when Aaron made the golden calf the people cried, "*These be thy gods, O Israel, which brought thee out of the land of Egypt*"; and Aaron made proclamation and said, "*To-morrow is a feast to the Lord*"—*i.e.* to Jehovah [1]—whom they still intended to worship. But this false worship of the true God met with His righteous indignation. God knows the tendency in the heart of man to materialise the Godhead. He will have no "similitude," no "likeness," no image, for religious purposes. He "*is a Spirit, and they that worship Him must worship in spirit and in truth.*"

[1] Exod. xxxii. 5.

The idea of making an image a "conduit"[1] by which worship is to reach God is alien to the whole revelation, which condemns image-making of every kind. It is "will-worship" of the worst description.[2]

So strongly is Scripture against images, that Romanists are driven to the solitary instance of the cherubim, unmindful that these were not images for worship, but symbols placed with other symbols in the Holy of Holies, where no eye could see them but the high priest's, and that on only one day in the year.

The early Fathers are unanimously against the use of images. The attempts to diminish their testimony are strained and vain. F. Ryder admits that "the early Fathers were shy of the use of images."[3] They are more than shy, they denounce it and compare it to the idolatry of the heathen. When Eusebius heard of a chalice with the figure of the Good Shepherd represented upon it, he spoke of such methods of doing honour to Christ and the apostles as *consistent with the custom of the heathen*, who were wont to honour their deliverers in like manner. They were jealous against the first approaches of idolatry. The Catacombs contain no traces of statues or images during the first four centuries. Dr. Littledale gives a number of patristic authorities[4] against the practice, which

[1] Ryder, Cath. Cont. 114.
[2] Col. ii. 23.
[3] Cont. Cat. 120.
[4] "Plain Reasons," 43–47.

F. Ryder vainly attempts to explain away. His frequent assertions that the quotation from such and such a Father "*must be understood*"[1] to mean something different from what he says, or that "it *seems* to be directed against" something else, and not against the object mentioned, shows the grievous straits to which he is reduced.

Considering the acknowledged tendency of the veneration of images to pass into idolatry, the opposition of the early Church, and the unanimous testimony of Holy Scripture against all use of images in connection with religious worship, the defence falls to the ground, and the practice should be abandoned.

VENERATION OF RELICS.—As with the veneration of images, so of relics. Many Romanists, seeing their perilous tendency to idolatry, ignore them altogether. They take advantage of the discrepancies and divisions of their teachers to adopt a neutral position. Two points must strike every one who cares to study the subject—the uncertainty of their genuineness, and the want of all Scriptural support. Even Roman apologists[2] admit the uncertainty as to the genuineness of many so-called relics.[3] But still more humiliating is the way in which Holy Scripture is wrested in defence

[1] Cont. Cat. 120–124.

[2] Ryder's Cath. Cont., p. 92.

[3] For positive instances of shocking deception, see "Plain Reasons," pp. 51, 52.

of the doctrine. Thus Keenan defines relics as "precious remains which bring to remembrance distinguished sanctity,"[1] &c. Then to prove that "God Himself honoured relics, and through them wrought astonishing miracles," he mentions first the waters of Jordan being struck by Elijah and Elisha. How Elijah's mantle could be "a precious relic" when used by himself it is difficult to see, and not much less so when used immediately after by Elisha. Suffice that the appeal was not made to the mantle, but to God. According to the Roman Catholic version, the appeal to the mantle failed. "*Eliseus struck the waters with the mantle of Elias . . . and they were not divided. And he said, Where is now the God of Elias; and he struck the waters and they were divided*" (iv. Kings ii. 14, D.). Reference again is made to the rod of Moses, as though miracles and wonders were wrought by its means. To an unsophisticated mind the rod was merely a symbol of office, and the miracles were not wrought by it or through it, but directly by *God, who gave the command* and direction to His servant. Even the Ark is dragged in as a relic. As well might the whole Tabernacle be so called as any portion of its original sacred furniture. In the New Testament the instances brought forward are as unreasonable. The "hem of our Saviour's garment" which the woman touched is a *relic*, though its

[1] Cont. Cat., p. 154.

age and antiquity are not explained. "The handkerchiefs and aprons" which had touched the body of St. Paul, and even the *shadow* of St. Peter—a very intangible relic—are brought forward to uphold this doctrine of venerating relics and making pilgrimages to their shrimes.[1] A sense of shame comes over one in recording these sad excuses of learned men. What is this but "*handling the Word of God deceitfully*"?—(the Douay is "*adulterating*" the Word of God, but the Greek δολοῦντες is unquestionably "*handling deceitfully*") (2 Cor. iv. 2, R.V.). It seems difficult to suppose that ecclesiastics so distinguished could be ignorant of Scripture to the extent thus exhibited; they must therefore have hoped to play upon the credulity of others. Protestants and Romanists alike must learn never to trust a quotation made by these writers without *searching* out the passages for themselves, like the Bereans, and seeing whether the things suggested to them really are as represented.[2]

Even more Serious Thoughts.—What necessity is there for all these intricate and uncertain processes of creature-worship? Why ransack tombs for bones of martyrs? Why, if it were possible, disturb the rest of saints by millions of discordant prayers? Why fashion images of saints, the very sanctity in some cases being most questionable?

[1] Keenan's Cont. Cat., pp. 154, 155.
[2] Acts xvii. 11, D.

Why use these circuitous and unauthorised methods of approaching God? Why seek out "by-paths" when Christ Himself is "*the Way*"—God's own appointed way—when there is "*no salvation in any other*"?[1] Why try these human inventions and expedients when God is a reconciled Father; when the Lord Jesus has told us that *whatsoever we ask in His Name, believing, we shall receive?* Has not Christ promised to be with His disciples always to the end of the age? Are we not "*temples of the Holy Ghost*"? Could Divine privileges and invitations be greater, and is not the introduction of such trifles derogatory to the dignity of the worship of God and to the character of God Himself?

[1] Acts iv. 12, D.

["Images expelled from worship by Christian fervour, returned in triumph in Christian temples—images were introduced by the zeal of a succession of idolatrous popes. The martyrs' bones began to work miracles and Rome . . . prostrated herself before the unsavoury remnants of death. Prayers for the dead paved the way for the intercession of saints and the veneration of their relics." D. M. Panton, "Advance of Rome," page 11. (Thynne & Jarvis, 1s. net.)

Article XXII. specially condemns "the adoration as well of images as of reliques." When this Article was written the traffic in relics was a monstrous scandal. To cite but one instance—out of a multitude—Louis IX., of France, borrowed about £6,000 on the credit of the "genuine crown of thorns." —Nelson's Encyclopedia. Article on Relics.]

XXXVI

INDULGENCES

Q.—**What is the teaching of the Church of Rome upon the nature and value of Indulgences, and what authority is there for the doctrine?**

A.—The decree of the Council of Trent is as follows: "Since the power of granting indulgences has been bestowed by Christ upon His Church, and she has exercised this power divinely from the earliest antiquity, the holy Council teaches and enjoins that the use of indulgences, in the highest degree salutary to Christian people . . . is to be retained in the Church, and it condemns with anathema those who assert that they are useless, or deny that the power of granting them is in the Church" (Sess. xxv.). Almost every statement in this decree is utterly untrue. There is no warrant for it in Scripture or antiquity; it is closely connected with the doctrine of purgatory, and is mainly a device to mitigate the supposed punishment there inflicted upon justified souls. The language of the decree is very vague, so that the nature and use of indulgences have to be gathered from the writ-

ings of Romish doctors and the actual directions of successive Popes.

The present doctrine and practice of the Church of Rome was confessedly unknown to the undivided Church of the first ten centuries, and has never been received by the Greek Church any more than by the Churches of the Reformation. F. Ryder says, "No doubt the modern use of indulgences did not begin till the Middle Ages";[1] and Lépicier, in his large book on indulgences, virtually admits that "the (Roman) Church never granted indulgences previous to the eleventh century."[2] These admissions at once destroy its authority as a Catholic doctrine in the true sense of the word; it is comparatively modern and peculiar to Rome.

The doctrine is defined by Amort, the great Romish authority, as "a remission of the punishment which is still due to sin after sacramental absolution, this remission being valid in the court of conscience and before God, and being made by an application of the *treasure of the Church* on the part of a lawful superior."[3] To this other explanations are added, to lessen, if possible, the many complications which evidently puzzle even Romanists, *e.g.* "An indulgence does not remit either the guilt or the eternal punishment of sin, much less does it

[1] Cath. Cont. 220.
[2] "Indulgences, their Nature and Origin," 81.
[3] Catholic Dictionary, 482.

give permission to commit sin for the future." This doubtless is in reference to Tetzel and others, who claimed this power before the Reformation. "An indulgence cannot be obtained for an unforgiven sin. If the phrase 'remission of sin' occurs in the grant of an indulgence, the Church uses the word to signify the remission of punishment." Again, "An indulgence does not only remit, but also satisfies the justice of God for the temporal punishment of sin"; it is "*solutio* as well as *absolutio*, both payment and remission." It may assist the reader to understand these quotations if reminded that, according to Romish teaching, (1) the guilt of sin is forgiven and the deliverance from eternal punishment in hell obtained by the sacrament of penance; (2) that "temporal punishment" in the above passages refers chiefly to the soul's punishment in purgatory — purgatory being the supplement to penance; and (3) that only those souls are admitted into purgatory who have been justified and sanctified previous to their death. The definition of indulgences given by Amort can now be considered in its relation to (1) the Treasury of the Church, (2) its use for the remission of punishment, *i.e.* for shortening the pains of purgatory, and (3) its application by a "lawful superior," with the further necessary questions as to the nature of indulgences and the degree or duration of the remission obtained thereby.

TREASURY OF THE CHURCH.—It is acknowledged that this expression does not occur until the eleventh century. This TREASURY is said to consist of the superfluity of Christ's merits, to which are added the merits of the Virgin Mary and of saints who had done works of supererogation. "The Church has recourse to the infinite merits of Christ, which suffice to satisfy *for all guilt and all penalty*, and to the merits of saints who have done penance more than sufficient to pay the temporal punishment due to their sins";[1] so that there is supposed to be made "an actual payment to God of an equivalent furnished to the sinner by the Church out of its inexhaustible treasure."

The idea is a compound of errors. It has already been abundantly shown that it is impossible for sinful and imperfect man to live better than he ought, to do more than God requires, to suffer more than his personal discipline and sanctification demand.[2] The very thought contains in itself the sin of pride. Then, to imagine that any such merits, if possible, could be added to the merits of the Son of God is as preposterous (not to mention its irreverence) as to suppose that a rushlight would add

[1] Catholic Dictionary, 483.

[2] "Supererogation," see p. 189. Luther's mode of putting the difficulty is striking—"The treasure of the Church could not be the merits of the saints, for no one had entirely fulfilled the law of God; nor the merits of Christ, for that was the treasure of the whole Church."—*Creighton's* "*Papacy*," vi. 84.

to the glory of the midday sun. Cardinal Cajetan once wrote that "one drop of Christ's blood was enough to wash away the sins of millions of worlds if they existed."[1] Yet the Church of Rome must needs invent some other modes of remission and treat the sacrifice of Christ as insufficient! It is impossible to add to the merits of the Incarnate God, but, alas! it seems possible for man to insult them by mixing with them the stained and imperfect doings of men. There is ONE Sacrifice and ONE Priest Who is "*able to save to the uttermost.*" It is perilous for any soul to dare to detract from or to add to the perfect atonement of Christ Jesus.

REMISSION OF PUNISHMENT.—Rome uses the same arguments for indulgences as for the doctrine of purgatory, viz., that temporal punishment must be exacted after the forgiveness of sin, and the same instances are alleged from the punishment of David after his grievous fall and forgiveness, and of the incestuous Corinthian. But both these instances have reference to this *present life*, and what pertains to *this life* is no guide or rule for the *next*; also, an occasional judgment such as that inflicted on David, or Ananias and Sapphira, is a warning, not a law. No punishment of *pardoned* souls *after death* is ever hinted at in Scripture. The whole teaching of Scripture is, that whom God forgives He forgives

[1] Lépicier, p. 320.

freely and He forgives fully for Christ's sake; nor is there the slightest allusion to any sufferings of believers after death. Even the Apocryphal Book of Wisdom (iii. 1–3) is against this reasoning: "The souls of the just are in the hand of God, and the torment of death shall not touch them. In the sight of the unwise they seemed to die; and their departure was taken for misery, and their going away from us as utter destruction; BUT THEY ARE AT PEACE." The question really turns on the character of God in His relation to pardoned sinners. Rome asserts that they still owe "a compensation to God" in the form of present suffering, or punishment to be inflicted in Purgatory. Protestants believe that this was the very work which Christ accomplished by His sufferings and death, according to the teaching of St. Peter (1 Peter iii. 18, R.V.): "*Christ* SUFFERED *for sins once, that He might bring us to God.*" So St. Paul (2 Cor. v. 21, R.V.): "*Him* (Christ) *Who knew no sin, He* (God) *made to be sin on our behalf* (*i.e.* treated as a sinner), *that we might become the righteousness of God in Him.*" But if we are "the righteousness of God," we can no longer owe a penalty for pardoned sin—Christ's sufferings have sufficed. The very design of the expiatory work of the Lord Jesus was that God "*might Himself be just and the justifier of him that has faith in Jesus*" (Rom. iii. 26, R.V.). In Christ "*Mercy glorieth against judgment*" (James ii. 13, R.V.).

APPLICATION OF THE TREASURY OF THE CHURCH.—Indulgences are said to be a matter of jurisdiction, not of orders.[1] This signifies that all authority to dispense them proceeds from the Pope alone, and can be conveyed only by those whom he authorises so to do. Leo X. claimed that it belonged to the Pope by right, inasmuch as he inherited the "keys which opened the kingdom of heaven" (*Decret. per præsentes*). By the Pope's authority, bishops and prelates are permitted to give indulgences within certain limits. "Cardinals can grant indulgences of a hundred days or forty days, but the Pope only grants plenary indulgences."[2]

These indulgences are immensely numerous. A book called "The Raccolta," published by authority, is, we are told, "growing in bulk and size at every new edition." Some indulgences seem absurdly out of proportion to the conditions required, as "for a short prayer many years' pardon are often granted, and sometimes a *plenary* indulgence";[3] so writes Father Alexius M. Lépicier, D.D., he whose work on "Indulgences" is highly commended at Rome to be read by all. This "Raccolta" contains a list of the prayers and good works which the Holy See rewards with various indulgences. In the early development of the doctrine Popes gave indulgences in behalf of great enterprises. Pope

[1] So Catholic Dictionary. [2] "Threshold," p. 235.
[3] Lépicier, p. 212.

Urban II. made this the mainspring of the first Crusade. "For the labour of this holy enterprise the Pope granted a compensation. He *took it out of the Treasury of the Church.* He declared in the Council of Clermont (A.D. 1095) that he remitted, to those who would take up arms against the infidels, the penance due to their sins, and to those who would die in the combat the pardon of their sins and eternal life."[1] After this plenary indulgences were more largely employed by Popes, as in the second Crusade, also in the infamous wars against the Albigenses and Hussites, and against any who differed religiously from the Roman See. A "plenary indulgence and pardon from all their sins" was granted by Pope Sixtus V. to all who should join in the attempt of the Spaniards to depose Queen Elizabeth. They were granted also to obtain money for the erection of cathedrals, churches, and monasteries, and reached their climax in the vast sums raised for the erection of St. Peter's at Rome.

With the light of the Reformation open scandals were suppressed, but the practice has never ceased. According to Roman authorities it is still increasing. They tell us that indulgences without number are given to the seven chief Churches at Rome, to pilgrimages to holy places, to those who wear the scapular of the Virgin, to Confraternities, to privileged altars, to the Jubilees of Popes, to crosses, &c.

[1] Lépicier, p. 212.

which have been blessed, so that there is now scarcely a devotion or good work for which they may not be obtained.[1] Lépicier mentions an indulgence of fifty days for the use of the short ejaculation, "My God and my all;" and "My Jesus, mercy," has the promise of some hundred days' indulgence. An indulgence of two hundred years can be gained by the recitation of the Rosary of the Seven Dolours, and every year the Pope grants an indulgence of one hundred years for each day of the Novena preparation to the feast of Christmas as the Novena is observed at Rome.[2] A multitude of other instances might be given, but it is painful to dwell on such solemn yet, in a manner, frivolous disregard of the infinite love of Christ, and of the complete pardon of sin which He is ever ready to bestow upon the contrite and believing soul.

[1] Cath. Dict., p. 486.

[2] Lépicier, 302, 348.

XXXVII

UNCERTAINTY OF INDULGENCES

Q.—Is it true that Romanists do not profess to know with certainty how far the Indulgences they have sought or paid for benefit the souls of those for whom they were obtained?

A.—It is quite true. The whole system of indulgences is rendered valueless by its UNCERTAINTY. The man or woman who seeks an indulgence is never sure that it has been obtained, much less can he know when the soul of his friend will be released from the sufferings of Purgatory. Hear Dr. Bagshawe.[1] He writes, "The authority of the Church in the remission of punishment is without any restriction, but it *does not follow* therefore that we can, in practice, tell *what amount of remission we have received.* We may obtain an indulgence for a certain number of days or years, but we do not at all know what proportion *this may bear to the punishment awarded by Almighty God for our sins.*" Again, "To gain a plenary indulgence, there are certain conditions required before they can fully take effect, *about which*

[1] "Threshold of the Catholic Church."

we cannot ever feel very sure. We can never know very exactly what our dispositions are in these matters, and therefore we cannot tell that we have completely gained *any* indulgence"[1]—a very sorry and sorrowful conclusion to a devout Romanist who has been spending time, money, and prayer to obtain through a man-made *system* what could be immediately obtained from the tender and compassionate *Saviour*, even the Lord Jesus Christ.

WHY SO MANY INDULGENCES?—Probably under the UNCERTAINTY which prevails, and which prevents the knowledge that an indulgence has really been obtained, it is thought the more the better, or the safer. "In one way or another," says Dr. Bagshawe, "we are constantly incurring fresh liabilities, and therefore ought to appreciate the constant opportunities which are granted to us of *easily* obtaining the remission of temporal punishment."[2] He also suggests another reason: "It may appear surprising that so many indulgences should be granted. You must remember how imperfectly we understand the *awful depths* of God's justice. 'The Lord thy God is a consuming fire' (Deut. iv. 24). 'Thy justice is as the mountains of God, Thy judgments are a great deep' (Ps. xxxv. 7, D.). We ought never, therefore, to be satisfied that we have done enough to discharge the debts we owe to His *terrible justice.*"[3] Lépicier

[1] "Threshold of the Catholic Church," 233–235.
[2] Ibid., 236. [3] Ibid., 236.

assigns a very different reason for this multiplication of indulgences, viz., the *clemency* of the Church: "We are, with regard to the faithful who have preceded us, the younger children of the Church. She then loves to show us, whom she has begotten in a riper age, signs of greater benignity, of an *easier* forgiveness than she ever showed to our elder brothers."[1] Again, "She takes into consideration the growing weakness of human nature and the new and fierce temptations that harass her children."[2] Amid all these various views of Romish writers, the one true cause of the uncertainty which should harass the soul of every sincere and devout Romanist is the conviction *that the whole doctrine is without foundation in the Word of God*—that there is no text that can be honestly pleaded in its behalf—and still more seriously, that it runs counter to a multitude of passages which ascribe salvation and the satisfaction of God's justice solely to the perfect work and expiation of His beloved Son.

TRANSFER OF SATISFACTIONS.—As a further development of the doctrine of indulgences and of works of supererogation, Rome teaches that individuals can perform an excess of satisfaction to God for the punishment of their own sins, and that this *excess* of "satisfaction" may be transferred to the benefit of others. In the language of the Catechism of the Council of Trent—"No man may be contrite

[1] Lépicier, p. 344. [2] Ibid.

or confess for another, but those who are endowed with divine grace *may pay for one another what is due to God.*"[1] The instances given by Lépicier are those chiefly of anchorites who "stood upright in the open air, thus trying to overcome sleep," or "with their hands tied behind their backs, their head bent towards the ground, as if unworthy to look upwards; others, again, "would sit on ashes, with their head between their knees, and strike the ground with their foreheads," and some, "with their eyes continually fixed on heaven, asking God with many tears to have pity on them."[2] On these melancholy instances the writer remarks, "What an amount of superabundant satisfactions must have been gained." Should we not rather say that those who were asking God "*to have pity on them*" could have had no superfluity of satisfaction, or they would have been in conscious peace and joy? The instances only prove that they had no just ideas of God as a God of love, and no real faith in the satisfaction made by Christ; they confirm a well-known truth, that men may be sincere and yet terribly deluded. But this supposed possible "transfer of satisfaction" depends upon the doctrine of works of supererogation, which has already been refuted: the two fall together (see p. 189).

[1] Lépicier, p. 15. [2] Ibid., p. 17.

XXXVIII

ROME'S ARGUMENTS FOR INDULGENCES

Q.—What Arguments do Romanists bring forward to support this doctrine of Indulgences?

A.—It would naturally be expected that a doctrine so universally practised would be plainly and forcibly insisted upon in God's own Word. But when Romanists are asked for proofs from the Bible or from the writings of the early Fathers, there is an ominous silence, or the references given prove on the slightest examination not to be *ad rem;* they are not to the point. The arguments from need of punishment for pardoned sin and from works of supererogation have been already answered (see pp. 189, 207). It may be said without exaggeration and without bitterness, that their apologies consist mainly of supposed analogies —analogies which, when sifted, are not worthy of the name—which are misapplied and *false* as regards the doctrine in question. For example, it is said that in the early ages those who were about to suffer martyrdom sometimes wrote letters on behalf of their brethren who might be suffering the lengthened penalties then inflicted for apostasy or other

serious faults; and if the bishop appealed to was satisfied of their contrition, there was granted to the penitent a relaxation of the canonical penalties. To call this an indulgence is a misuse of language, since the persons thus benefited were *living* persons, and the relaxation had reference to *Church discipline* only, and not to any satisfaction or compensation to *be made to God after death.* Equally unreasonable are the analogies attempted to be drawn from the forgiveness of children by their parents at the request of loving brothers and sisters; the abridgment of punishment by the sovereign on the recommendation of juries and of magistrates on account of the worthiness of the prisoner's relatives. These have nothing of the principle of a Romish indulgence, which has to do with sins as *sins*, and with the shortening of the sufferings in a supposed purgatory in the *intermediate state.* These earthly relaxations are the results of kind-heartedness and extenuating circumstances relative to *this life only*, without any *satisfaction or* COMPENSATION *being paid by other persons.* Yet these are the strongest arguments alleged in the last greatly applauded Romish book on indulgences.[1] Perhaps the confession of our learned Bishop Fisher of Rochester before the Reformation sums up the matter with the most truthfulness: "Those who believe in purgatory must agree to indulgences. In former ages they had no purga-

[1] Lépicier, pp. 359–363.

tory, therefore they did not seek indulgences; we have purgatory, therefore we must have indulgences;"[1] whereby the *novelty* of both doctrines is admitted—their want of Divine authority and their invention by Rome.

From this painful consideration of the Roman doctrine of indulgences two great truths may be eliminated of paramount value and importance. The first is the grandeur and consolation of the true doctrine of the solidarity of the Church for good and not for evil. Doubtless the Lord Jesus intended that His disciples should form a society whose members should sympathise with and be helpful to each other. The great universal Church of Christ is compared to a body in which the members care for one another, in which the feeblest member is necessary, and in which the health and growth of the whole is promoted by that which *every* part supplieth.[2] The prayers of all, in proportion to their agreement, earnestness, and reality, contribute to the increase of the Church at large. It is a vast family—a brotherhood by virtue of the incarnation—in which love ought to be strong and interest mutual, extending to every part. In the sins and sorrows of this body—the Church—every member shares, as Daniel did in the iniquities and calamities of the Church in his day. In the strength

[1] See Fisherii Opera, Art. xviii. pp. 496, 497.

[2] Eph. i. 23, iv. 16; 1 Cor. xii. 12.

and prosperity and joy and victories of this Church every believing soul also participates, "high and low, rich and poor, one with another," assisted by its prayers, consoled by its fellowship, strengthened by its progress, cheered by its common faith, stimulated by its holiness, cleansed by the one fountain opened for sin and for uncleanness,[1] Jesus Christ, sanctified by the one Life-giver, the Holy Ghost. This is the Scriptural ideal of the solidarity of the Church in Christ for the help and growth of all its members and of the whole body.

The other truth which stands forth as the light out of this obscurity of uncertainty—this cloud of sacerdotal invention—is the simplicity and completeness of God's revealed plan of salvation. The Romanist, be he never so devout, is always in bewilderment as to his state before God. Under conviction of sin he must go to a priest; he must confess to this priest every fault that he can remember; he must submit to his "judicial" examination in secrecy; he may then receive sacramental absolution, and perform the penance that may be pronounced necessary for his pardon and deliverance from guilt and from eternal hell. But this great deliverance does not, strange to say, absolve from an uncertain debt, which, in the vast majority of cases, has to be paid to the justice of God by hell-like torments in purgatory—torments which he is

[1] Zech. xiii. 1.

taught may be shortened by acts and offerings at privileged altars, and countless other methods sanctioned by the Pope for obtaining indulgences of uncertain value, which are by *suffrages* only, *i.e.* by prayers, and not guaranteed by any *covenant on the part of God.* And the whole of this has to be repeated at least once a year through the whole life, with a continual uncertainty as to the state of his heart, the depth of his repentance, the intention of the priest, the fulfilment of conditions which he may unconsciously fail to satisfy. Is this the teaching of Jesus Christ? Did our Lord in coming "*to seek and to save that which was lost*" anywhere unfold this intricate and uncertain scheme? Did St. Paul teach it to the elders at Miletus? or convey it in his episcopal, or at least apostolic instructions which he gave to Timothy and Titus when he wrote for them three letters on the discipline and guidance necessary for their Churches? Did St. Peter mention this "use of the keys" in his Epistles? Whence THIS SILENCE on a matter declared *since the eleventh century* to be so essential to the Church, to be believed under the penalty of an anathema? Surely because the doctrine had no foundation in the mind of Christ or in the commission of the Holy Ghost. Surely because it is in utter contradiction to the Gospel of the Holy Redeemer!

XXXIX

INTENTION

Q.—Is it true that the doctrine of Intention taught by the Church of Rome has at any time invalidated the sacraments and orders as administered by that Church?

A.—It is difficult to know why the Church invented the doctrine, nor has the "living voice" determined what degree of intention is required in her sacraments. Some think it was adopted as a counterpoise to the doctrine of the *ex opere operato*, *i.e.* sacramental efficacy "through the mere act performed," and so to secure a certain amount of faith and reality on the part of all concerned in the use and administration of the sacraments. The language of the 11th canon (Sess. vii. Council of Trent) is very elastic: "If any one saith that in ministers, when they effect and confer the sacraments, there is not required the intention of at least doing what the Church does, let him be anathema." Its proposal was strongly opposed by the Bishop of Minori, who was present at the Council: "The bishop thought they ought to consider what grief

of mind it would occasion a father of tender feeling towards a dying son, if it occurred to him to doubt the intention of the priest who was baptizing his child," setting forth also the effect of a baptism without intention as invalidating the confirmation, communion, and ordination of the child if he should become a man, a priest, and a bishop, with all rites which such a bishop might perform. This is more than a possible result, considering the multitude of priests and bishops, and the sceptical and immoral characters which have been numbered amongst them. Hence, Roman theologians have given the dogma very different interpretations, some maintaining a great reality in the doctrine, and others reducing it to a nonentity. Thus some have maintained that the intention to perform the external ceremony suffices, but Pope Alexander VIII. condemned this opinion in 1680. This casts a doubt upon the validity of all absolutions, which many theologians admit, but which they are unable to rectify; and in reply to the argument that it is contrary to Divine justice that penitent sinners or helpless infants should "be damned through the malice of a priest," Ferraris[1] can merely say "that they are damned for their sin, actual or original; God has duly provided the means for their salvation, and is not bound, even if He could, to prevent the malice of His minister." These

[1] Ferraris, "Prompta Bibl." s.v. Intention.

shocking but necessary results of any earnest view of the doctrine have caused other theologians to lower its meaning and requirement. Thus the Catholic Dictionary writes: The priest "need not intend to produce the effect of the sacrament, or to perform the rite as a sacrament, or to do what the Catholic or Roman Church does; it is enough that he should intend in some general way to do what the Church does, whatever his notion about the Church, the sacrament, its effect and object may be." So "an infidel or a Calvinist may baptize, or, if he is a priest, may say mass validly." And again: "The (Roman) Church recognises many sacraments given by heretics, infidels, and even Pagans." The same Romanist, however, adds, "It is quite true that the majority of school theologians believe that secret withholding of the intention is enough to invalidate the sacrament," *i.e.* any of the seven rites, including Orders, which bear that name in the Roman Church. F. Ryder admits that "the question is still open." The subject is of no consequence to Protestants, who take the simple rational view that every man intends to do what he does, and that the effect of Christ's ordinances and the gifts of God's grace are not taken away by the unworthiness of ministers,[1] but the doubt and questioning to many a Romanist is appalling. A Romish priest writing on the Spanish Inquisition says that per-

[1] See Art. xxvi., Church of England.

secution had produced "a class of Jews who were such at heart, although by open profession they had become Christians. These were in league with the open adherents of their national (Jewish) creed, and were the more dangerous because their machinations against the Catholic (Roman) religion were carried on in the dark." The extent of the evil may be realised somewhat when it is said that "*not a few of these secret Jews had risen to high ecclesiastical dignities, some even to bishoprics.*"[1] What effect had these "machinations against the Catholic religion"? If intention had the meaning assigned to it by "the majority of school theologians," then the sacraments were null, and the clergy, whom such Jews had ordained priests or bishops, had no grace or commission, and the defect would work on increasingly and incessantly. If intention did not invalidate their acts, then it is a sham. But why does not the "living voice" speak with authority on the subject, and remove what must be an awful anxiety on the part of the more serious members of the Church?

[1] "Historical Papers," p. 5.

[The Council of Florence (1442) decreed "The sacraments of the new law are seven. . . . All these sacraments are perfected by three things, namely, by *things* as to the *matter*, by *words* as to the *form*, and by the *person* of the administrator who confers the sacrament with the intention of doing what the Church does; of which if any be wanting, the sacrament is not perfected."

The Roman Missal (Defects of the Mass, Sec. 7) reads thus, "If any man has before him eleven wafers and intends to consecrate only ten, not determining what ten he intends, in these cases he does not consecrate, because the intention is required."

It is a strange belief that a priest can wholly overthrow the design and make void the institution of our Saviour, for it is possible that he may have no intention, and if so, what would become of the sacrament which our Lord instituted? What a chaos of doubts and uncertainties regarding the priest's intention is thus cast upon the minds of Roman Catholics, for none of the sacraments can be truly administered without the intention of the priest which is absolutely unknown to the recipient. This necessity of intention works as many miracles of uncertainty, to the subversion of certainty of religion, as transubstantiation doth to the destruction of sense, reason, and faith. Gibson's Reservation, Vol. 2, chap. 1.]

PART III

SOME QUESTIONS OF THE DAY CONNECTED WITH MODERN ROMANISM

XL

NEW DEVOTIONS AND MODES OF WORSHIP [1]

Q.—Is it true that New Devotions and modes of worship are being largely adopted in Roman Catholic countries?

A.—It is only too true. Roman devotions seem no longer to seek the sanction of history or the precedents of the primitive Church. Sometimes they do not even wait for the formal authorisation of Infallibility. So rapidly have they increased in the present century, and in such peculiar modes, that they may ultimately impress a new character upon Christianity, and give it a new aspect in Roman Catholic nations. Many Romanists observe with alarm that the new cults are pushing aside the old Scriptural doctrines of the Nicene Creed, so that the latter awaken little contemplation and reverence compared with the modern religious observances which are sweeping over the Latin races—France being distinguished for its fervour in their behalf.

[1] The writer is much indebted to a book called "Some Features of Modern Romanism," most calmly and impartially written. S.P.C.K.

I. The new doctrine of the IMMACULATE CONCEPTION is calling forth a new literature. Thus there has been prepared "A Little Office of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary."[1] Its first sentences are:—

> "Sing, O my tongue, and sing in joyful lays,
> The spotless Virgin's, our good Mother's praise,
> Gracious Lady, come unto my aid,
> Screen me from my foes, O spotless Maid."

Hymns and ejaculations, prayers and antiphons, follow with the so-called "Commendation":—

> "Mother mild, our eyes to thee
> We thy suppliants raise:
> And do thou accept these hymns
> Offered in thy praise.
> Guide us through life's stormy course
> Till our latest breath,
> Sweetest Mary! and do thou
> Help us at our death. Amen."

Whilst these are instances of direct petitions to Mary for personal aid, others are blended with requests for her intercession. "Holy Mary, Queen of Heaven, Mother of our Lord Jesus Christ, *and Mistress of the world*, who never forsakest or despisest any one; look down mercifully upon me, gracious Queen, with thine eyes of pity, and obtain for me from thy beloved Son pardon for all my sins; that, as I now commemorate with devout affection

[1] Published by "Catholic Publishing Company."

thy holy and Immaculate Conception, I may hereafter receive the reward of eternal happiness, through the mercy of Him whom thou, a virgin, didst bring forth," &c. The language is extravagant and unscriptural, nor does the introduction of the Saviour's name conceal the petitioner's dependence for eternal happiness upon Mary's intercession rather than upon the Redeemer's love.

II. Another cult or devotion commended to all Romanists is that of ST. JOSEPH—a devotion said to have been "reserved by the Providence of God for these latter days." It is a truly *modern* cult, St. Joseph having been appointed so recently as December 8, 1870, to be the "Patron of the Universal Church."

So rapidly has this devotion spread, that the whole month of March has been dedicated to his worship, as May and October to Mary, and June to the Sacred Heart. The following is part of an exhortation to parish priests: "Let us prepare ourselves piously, pastors and flocks, for the exercises of the month of March. Let each day bring us again to the feet of the blessed altars of St. Joseph, and let our prayers mount ardent and confident to *him in whose hands Jesus Christ has left in heaven the key of His infinite favours.* Which of us has not a favour to ask?"[1]

In "The People's Manual of St. Joseph," pre-

[1] *French Diocesan Journal of Bayonne*, p. 179, March 7, 1886.

pared by Cardinal Vaughan, the subject is thus introduced: "Of old it was said to the needy and suffering people in the kingdom of Egypt, 'Go to Joseph, and do all that he shall say to you.' The same is now said by the Sovereign Pontiff to all needy and suffering people in the kingdom of the Church—'Go to JOSEPH.'" These words of the Egyptian monarch form the favourite inscription on many modern Roman Catholic churches, as if they had been spoken by Christ to His Church. Strange misapplication, not without a touch of irreverence.

Having thus introduced the saint, the Cardinal goes on to answer the question, "Who is Joseph?" "He is one whose office belongs to the order of the hypostatic union," p. 4. "He is the patron of the Catholic Church," p. 5. "He is the third person of the earthly Trinity," p. 5. St. Joseph's power is thus extolled: "Our Lord would have us understand that as He was subject to Joseph on earth, so now our Lord in heaven grants all his petitions." "Go to Joseph, and obey him as Jesus and Mary obeyed him." "*Joseph has received all power necessary for the salvation of souls*," p. 14. "Honour Joseph by saying, 'King of Saints, King of Angels,' &c. Truly Joseph behaves like a king to those who serve him," p. 33. Among the testimonies to his power is that of St. Teresa: "I cannot call to mind that I have at any time asked him for anything

which he has not granted." Again, "He (Jesus) has given him the grace to help us in all things."

The devotion is encouraged by indulgences, some plenary, and others for 300 days, applicable to the souls in purgatory, pp. 47 and 51.

The "Praises of Joseph" are numerous:—

> "Hail, Joseph, image of God the Father:
> Hail, Joseph, father of God the Son:
> Hail, Joseph, treasury of the Holy Spirit:
> Hail, Joseph, delight of the Blessed Trinity," &c., &c.

It is sad to read these groundless and presumptuous powers and merits attributed in an English manual to St. Joseph. How different from the impression of his modesty and humility as recorded in the Gospels! When Scripture is silent, how can man dare thus to speak! The French "Mois de Joseph" naturally surpasses the English. In its 166th edition (mark the number, therefore the extent of the cult) it does not hesitate to say that "St. Joseph was purified before his birth." What authority is there for this?

It is important to notice that Dr. Vaughan, in his "Manual of Joseph," twice writes of Joseph as belonging to the "order of the hypostatic union." The language is distinctly heretical. The Roman Catholic Dictionary rightly defines the hypostatic union as "the union of Christ's human nature with the hypostasis or person of God the Word;" and again "By the hypostatic union the Godhead is

indissolubly united to human nature." This is the universally recognised meaning of the term: it can pertain only to the Trinity in relation to the Incarnate Son of God. Yet here it is claimed for a mere man! Well might Dr. Pusey say that Rome's treatment of Mary (and now of Joseph) disturbs the relations of the Blessed Trinity.

III. Worship of the SACRED HEART OF JESUS.—This is emphatically one of the modern devotions of this century, although founded upon a vision stated to have been granted two hundred years ago. It is to be noticed that most of Rome's modern devotions are received upon the authority of reputed saintly women, especially nuns,[1] who, through neglect of the ordinary rules of health,[2] became

[1] The festival of Corpus Christi was due to a vision reported to have been frequently seen by a nun Juliana in the thirteenth century. The cult of the "Miraculous Medal," now approved by the Roman "Congregation of Rites," and practised in Paris, arose from the statement of Catherine Labouré, a Sister of Charity, that the Virgin Mary appeared to her November 27, 1830, and a voice bade her "strike a medal" after a model of the Virgin seen in a vision when the *sister was quite alone.*

[2] Take the record of Philomène de Saint Colombe. "She began a fresh fast after the Lenten one (with the consent of her superiors) on the first day of May until the last day of the same month. During this time she took only a morsel of bread, *and that only on Sundays;* as to the other days, her only nourishment was the Holy Communion." Add to this the report of the tribunal appointed to examine her claims to veneration — "The crown of thorns garnished with needles, the iron chain with the heavy cross of wood which she carried on her shoulders while following the Way of the Cross, the hair shirt, the whips, and especially a kind of inner vest woven of points of rushes, which she concealed

emaciated and emotional, being in that state of mental and bodily prostration which renders the person liable to illusions, and to mistake the visionary for the real. In such a frame, after a protracted meditation before the sacrament, Margaret Mary Alacoque of Paray le Monial, A.D. 1684, believed herself to be favoured with a vision of the Sacred Heart of Jesus, "the very part of HIS BODY which is commonly so designated." For be it observed, the veritable object of the devotion of the Sacred Heart of Jesus is the MATERIAL Heart of the Divine Saviour, hypostatically united to the Word.[1] "We pay a direct adoration to the actual Heart of Jesus."[2] As the vision gradually obtained credence, religious devotions were offered in isolated places. Not until 1822 was the Feast of the Sacred Heart made obligatory in Paris. Yet now the whole month of June is given up to this worship, and the month called the "Month of the Sacred Heart."

This devotion was highly valued by Pope Leo XIII., who commended the Roman Catholic Church to the special care and benediction of the Sacred Heart of Jesus. He also placed its festival on

under her inner tunic, which must have caused horrible suffering." Poor woman! it was enough to make her delirious; but what about the system which commended this infatuation and brought her to premature death?

[1] "Explication du Catéchisme," par l'Abbé Guillois.

[2] "Feast of the Sacred Heart," Burns & Oates.

a level with the highest Christian festivals, and encouraged the devotion with numerous indulgences.

The Romanists in France are erecting a grand church on the hill Montmartre, at the cost of one million pounds, dedicated to the Sacred Heart, having commended France to the protection of this new devotion, and regarding this new church as an expiation for the crimes of the Commune, 1871. When will Rome learn that what pleases God is not a new magnificence and a new gorgeous ceremonial, but a new heart and a new life, "to do justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God"? (Micah vi. 8).

Happily, even on the Continent many do not limit their devotion exclusively to the *material* "heart." They give the rite a figurative significance, and turn from the material heart to the honour and contemplation of the love of Christ, of the affection and kindness of God our Saviour, and of the heart's love which His children owe to Him. In England this figurative and frequent use of the word "heart" to denote affection and devotedness at present virtually supplants the worship of the *material* "heart" among the educated classes. In a book called the "Manual of the Sacred Heart," the vision of Mary Alacoque does not appear. In it there are chapters in which the reader breathes a true Protestant atmosphere. The Lord Jesus is spoken of as possessing an unchanged love to sinners,

and prayers are addressed to Him without seeking access by saint or angel. No wonder that many should remark that Romanism in England is a different religion from Romanism abroad. But alas! this personal love of Christ, as unchanged and as accessible as He was by the Galilean lake, is already being OBSCURED :—

IV. The worship of the SACRED HEART OF THE VIRGIN MARY.—The devotees of the Virgin Mary have been alarmed at the progress of the spiritual and figurative teaching which pious Romanists have given to the new devotion of the Sacred Heart of Jesus. Unlimited belief in the love of Jesus and in the right of direct access to that love —so truly Protestant—would ultimately destroy Mariolatry and the Invocation of Saints. Therefore the worship of the "Very Sacred Heart of Mary" is now equally inculcated. We are told that it is under "the Palladium of the Sacred Heart of Mary that the nineteenth century has been placed to cure the chief sore of modern society—selfishness." In the Roman Catholic "Apostolate of Prayer" we meet with the following: "Divine Heart of Jesus, I offer to you, by the Immaculate Heart of Mary, the prayers, the works, the sufferings of this day in reparation for our offences." In a book called "The Little Month of the Sacred Heart" occurs this teaching on our Lord's first miracle: "But above all He (Jesus) wishes to teach me *that it*

is to Mary that I must first address myself. It is from her that comes the blood that Jesus Christ has shed on Calvary: she can bestow it on whom she pleases." In the same book we read: "It is by the intercession of Mary, it is by the Immaculate Heart of this Divine Mother, that I will address myself on every occasion to the Heart of Jesus." In a meditation on "Our Lady of the Sacred Heart" we are told, "Thus once more the world must know that, by God's will, all grace is to come to us through Mary, even that which flows from the Heart of Jesus."

This worship of separate members of the sacred body of our Lord is most strange. Offices of the precious blood and of the five wounds were more than questionable, but now has arisen another cult of the "Agonizing Heart of Jesus." Moreover, the Papacy has also sanctioned an "Arch-Confraternity of the HOLY FACE," that special honour may be given to this portion of the Incarnate Christ. This devotion is said to be spreading rapidly through the whole of France, and the "image of the Holy Face" is being exhibited in many churches for the adoration of the faithful.

The only excuse pleaded for this adoration of particular members of the sacred body is that whatever honour is given to one member is given to Christ as a whole. Then why attempt to divide Christ? The argument resembles that by which

in the Eucharist Romanists hold that Christ's blood is contained in the bread and Christ's body is contained in the wine. But there is no more authority in Scripture or the Fathers for the one supposition than for the other. Each is a subterfuge to defend doctrines invented by theologians of the Roman Church, but not revealed by God in Holy Scripture.

PILGRIMAGES.—The most popular of all Roman pilgrimages until recently was that to Loreto, in the province of Ancona, Italy. The great source of attraction is a plain brick building about 28 feet by 12½, supposed to be the house at Nazareth where Mary was born and received the Annunciation, and where Jesus found a home for many years. A legend relates that the Apostles turned the house into a church, and that when the Turks threatened it with destruction, it was transported by angels through the air and deposited (A.D. 1191) on a hill at Tersato in Dalmatia. In 1294, angels carried it across the Adriatic to a wood near Recanati; from this wood it was finally removed to its present site at Loreto, where it has since been permitted to remain. Bulls in favour of the shrine were issued by Pope Sixtus IV. in 1481, and by Julius II. in 1507, the latter alluding to the tradition very cautiously—"ut pie creditur et fama est" (*as is piously believed and as is the report*). Leo XIII. has confirmed previous privileges granted to the festival of the holy house of Loreto and added others. This

Pope declares plainly that this is the house where "The Word was made flesh." It is a legend of the dark ages, of which no trace can be found until after the Crusades. It is to be noticed that devotions connected with pilgrimages to holy places had considerably declined until the Pontificate of the present amiable and politic, but most superstitious of recent Popes, Leo XIII., who has given his seal to the alleged apparition of the Virgin Mary to the Gascon peasant girl at Lourdes, and to the Virgin's words in Gascon, "Jou souy la Immaculée Concepcioun" ("I am the Immaculate Conception"). A special office has been sanctioned, masses appointed, an annual festival fixed, and the usual privileges and indulgences granted to pilgrims. These pilgrims are reckoned by the 100,000. It is stated that 371,000 communions were celebrated in 1885. In addition to this, 100,000 bottles of water from the grotto are sent to invalids at a distance. The Pope having spoken, no one dares to question this most questionable cult of the century. Yet this pilgrimage to Lourdes is one of the most profitless of devotions, except that it brings an enormous income to the priests and to the Church. It is allowed by those most nearly concerned that the cures do not affect more than five per cent. of the sick. The sight of the returning multitudes is harrowing—disappointed, saddened, their sicknesses at times aggravated by the excitement and the fatigue. They had crowded

the services, presented self-denying offerings, drunk the waters, prayed fervently—yet in vain! As a London doctor observed truly, "If we did not cure a much higher percentage than are cured at Lourdes, our hospitals would soon be closed." The priests and doctors at Lourdes now honourably admit this, and dwell chiefly on the spiritual benefit to be obtained from the pilgrimage. That God hears prayer at Lourdes as well as at every other place none will question, but it cannot be proved that Lourdes possesses any peculiar privilege in this respect.

The whole system is mischievous. It is a concession to the restlessness and shallowness of the age. People are encouraged to run to and fro on the earth for religious as for other modes of excitement. There is much appearance of zeal, but there is a lack of solidity; there is much profession, but there is little depth of faith; much gaining of indulgences and few victories over sin; less personal study of those deep things of God which strengthen the character.

But chiefly these pilgrimages fail because they are an utter distrust, if not defiance, of the Providence of God. Are we not told that God is "*no respecter of persons*," and that "*He turneth Him unto the prayer of the poor and destitute*"? Pilgrimages contradict this royal method of His love. Like the divers altars of the heathen Balak, they assume that

God is accessible in one place rather than at another. From Rome's standpoint, they offer an indignity to the Virgin, as if she were affected by a petty wilfulness, regardless of the circumstances of her devotees; they imply a want of justice and considerateness on her part towards those who cannot bear the expenses of the journey; above all, they obscure the vital principle of all acceptable prayer, which is conditioned by the state of the heart of him who prays, not by the place whereon he kneels, and by that law of revelation which directs that prayer shall be made to God alone.

Pilgrimages have no Divine authority and no Scriptural precedent, unless the instance of those superstitious Israelites be quoted who offered incense to the brazen serpent. King Hezekiah, when informed of it, had the serpent broken in pieces, calling it by the contemptuous word "Nehustan" ("a piece of brass"). Romanists have equal reason to be ashamed of the instances of modern superstition and of the dangers they involve. Let the reader ponder over the following words of a learned Roman Catholic after reading a book on the cults of the Sacred Heart of Jesus and that of Mary: "We are strangely embarrassed when, after reading this sort of book, we happen to meet with this fundamental axiom of Christianity, so clearly and so magnificently expressed by the Apostles: '*There is*

not salvation in any other, for there is no other name under heaven given to men whereby we must be saved' "[1] (Acts iv. 12, D.), that is—CHRIST JESUS.

Surely many Romanists in their heart of hearts must feel his perplexities and echo his words!

[1] *Biographie Universelle of F. X. de Feller.* Paris, 1841, vol. v., s.v. Galifet.

[Additional Note, 1926.—It is now computed that in very favourable years nearly 600,000 pilgrims have made the journey to Lourdes, and that the lowest yearly average is 300,000. In the innermost part of the Grotto there are piles of letters superstitiously addressed to the Virgin. Idolatrous worship is paid to her in the following terms, "Mary, thou art our only hope." "Powerful Virgin, save our sick," while they prostrate themselves before her shrine.

The commercial aspect of these pilgrimages is thoroughly Roman—whenever money is wanted some new miracle working image or apparition is forthcoming. The traffic in candles, flowers, lamps, votive offerings, masses arranged according to tariff, bring much gain to the priests.

The Roman Catholic *Universe* stated that, "Devotion to our Lady of Lourdes is growing very rapidly in England."

The *National Review*, November, 1907, stated, "The Pope and Curia derive from the percental tax on the Lourdes concern the comfortable yearly income of £40,000."]

XLI

DEVELOPMENT

Q.—Although it is difficult to identify many Roman doctrines with the plain teaching of the Bible and of the Primitive Church, yet is there not some truth in the theory of Development?

A.—As it is, at least, doubtful whether the doctrine of Development has been so endorsed by the Pope as to be certainly a Roman dogma, it is scarcely right to treat it as such. But it is so largely made use of in Roman books and in controversy that it deserves consideration. Let it be at once acknowledged that there is a true as well as a false development in religion as in nature. There is a true development in Nature of the acorn into the oak, the caterpillar into the butterfly, the healthy infant into the perfect man. And in Revelation there is a true development. There is a growth, an expansion, a clearer and fuller understanding of some revealed truth, an application of principles to the changes of society, and the necessities, moral or spiritual, of successive generations. This arises from study, prayer, and the illumination of the Holy Spirit. Thus the Apostles,

after the forty days' intercourse with the risen Christ, and after the day of Pentecost, preached the Gospel with marvellous spiritual enlargement and augmented power. The Epistles are, in like manner, legitimate expansions of our Lord's teaching: *e.g.* St. Paul's teaching on justification follows from the important position Christ assigned to faith in St. John vi.[1] and elsewhere. The Epistle to the Hebrews develops our Lord's sacrificial words on the cross, "It is finished," so as to show the completion and sufficiency of Christ's redeeming work as the one sacrifice of the one Priest, of which there can be no repetition (as in the Jewish system). St. James's Epistle is largely drawn from the Sermon on the Mount, in fresh application to the circumstances of his day. The same is true of the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds; they are the expansion of previously admitted truths, the outcome and summary of those doctrines which are essential to salvation. Such logical deductions, such deeper insight into the pregnant words of Holy Writ, are still forthcoming, as the abundant commentaries of this century strikingly testify. Yet in all these cases it may be said with the Bishops of the Council of Nicæa that no new article of faith is propounded.

But a truth cannot be developed into anything alien, or discordant, or *contradictory*. The Holy

[1] See verses 29, 35, 40, 47.

Spirit cannot deny Himself—He cannot teach the Church anything contrary or alien to what He has permanently recorded in Holy Scripture. An acorn may be developed into an oak, but not into a willow: an infant into a man, with every limb in due proportion; but if the limbs are distorted, deficient, or disproportionate, disease must have taken the place of healthy development, and instead of the perfect man we have the cripple or the monster. Thus prayer *for* the Virgin Mary, offered so frequently by early Christians, has no true development in the prayers now offered *to* the Virgin Mary for her direct grace and assistance. "*Whatsoever* HE *saith unto you, do it*," has no true development in the authority now claimed for her over the Saviour.[1] The all-sufficiency of Christ's merits as "*able to save to the uttermost*," has only a false, a disloyal development when it is represented as so deficient as to need masses, penances, indulgences, and purgatory. That love and sympathy of Jesus, who is "*the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever*," is strangely distorted when it is now represented as indifferent to human sin and sorrow until influenced and persuaded by Mary and the Saints. That honour due to God alone which Christ taught, "*Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve*," is horribly perverted and infringed upon when it is proved that many

[1] See on Mariolatry, p. 226.

Romanists offer more prayers to Mary than to God; that Roman Catholic countries on the Mediterranean are popularly called *Marian* kingdoms; that the very heathen call the Roman places of worship "Mary churches" (and the Protestant, "Jesus churches"); that "books of piety," with their strange cults and devotions, have largely supplanted the reading of the Bible. These teachings are not the natural and logical developments of Holy Scripture, nor the results of the guiding Spirit of truth. And the same is the character of all the Articles added by Rome to the three Catholic Creeds as essential to salvation. These Articles of Popes Pius IV. and Pius IX. are not developments of truth, but of error and corruption; their teaching is discordant with the Word of God and primitive antiquity; their whole tendency is alien and heterogeneous in relation to the simple spiritual "*faith* ONCE FOR ALL *delivered to the saints*" (Jude 3).

The modern Roman Catholic religion, as contrasted with that of the Apostles, may be compared to the muddy and unwholesome water of the Thames at London Bridge contrasted with the clear, bright spring on the Gloucestershire borders. Is the Thames at London Bridge a true representation of the original spring? Is its pollution due to the development of the true nature of its source? Or is it not plainly due to accretions and additions of foreign matter—of drainage from villages, con-

tributions of unwholesome water, the refuse from factories and farmyards, the floodings of the lands and roads? True, the water of the pure spring is mingled with this impure growth of the stream, but how difficult to discover—what filtering is required to separate the pure from the impure, so that it may be wholesome and fit for use!

Such is Romanism. It is a religion enlarged and contaminated throughout its course by perpetual additions alien to the primitive revelation. Notice the dates of the several Roman doctrines. How they start up in different centuries from the sixth to the present, in which the two doctrines of the Immaculate Conception and of the Infallibility of the Pope have been proclaimed. History thus proves the Roman religion to have grown by *additions* to the pure Gospel of Christ, or by the development of *seeds of corruption*, not of the original truth.

True, as the water of the spring is in the Thames at London, so the "water of life," the truth of the Gospel, is in Romanism. Some of Rome's members through prayer, honest, earnest, and believing, are enabled to filter the unwholesome stream of traditions, to separate the true from the untrue. Many of these mourn over the superstitions which obscure the Saviour, hoping against hope for better days. Would that they had faith and courage to declare their convictions openly. But this would require the faith of martyrs.

XLII

MORALS AND SANCTITY

Q.—Rome constantly claims a greater degree of Sanctity for her members than she allows to Protestants; is not this a mistake?

A.—Certainly it is. Yet it is not to be wondered at that Romanists underrate the holiness of Protestants. They look naturally at things from their own standpoint, and as the religious life of Protestants is not so much outward and in evidence as their own, they are led to question its existence or extent—just as the heathen charged the early Christians with being atheists because they had no idols—nothing *visible* to adore. Take private prayer. Romanists are accustomed to frequent their churches for private prayer, and wonder at the little use which Protestants make of theirs to this end, not being aware that they take our Lord's direction more emphatically, "*But thou, when thou shalt pray, enter into thy chamber, and having shut the door, pray to thy Father in secret; and thy Father, who seeth in secret, will reward thee*" (Matt. vi. 6, D.). Protestants probably pray more frequently, but they do not

attract attention. Take what are called "DEVOTIONS." Some devout Romanists attend daily mass, frequent services on the numerous appointed saints days; they visit the images and relics of *canonised* persons; they belong to confraternities and look for indulgences and remission of punishment in purgatory by observing the "Month of Mary," or of "Joseph," or the cult of the "Sacred Heart;" they fast also on certain days and in Lent. Many of these "devotions" Protestants believe to be unscriptural, and the carnivals before and even during Lent give an air of unreality to the Roman observance of that holy season. Daily prayers and days sacred to New Testament saints and the seasons of Lent and Advent are largely observed by Protestants, but family prayer, at which servants and children are present, holds an important place in their practice of religion. They know the privilege of personal communion with Christ Himself, and find in the riches of His grace and love infinitely more than in the unauthorised "devotions" which Rome has sanctioned. Here again is less of the *outward*, but more of the spiritual and the *inward*; less of saints, but more of Christ; less of what is visible to the public eye, but more of what the Apostle St. Paul meant when he wrote "*your life is hidden with Christ in God*" (Col. iii. 3, D.).

Take RELIGIOUS AND DEVOTIONAL READING. Romanists have a large class of books of the nature of

manuals, and though they are usually marred by the introduction of Rome's special and uncatholic doctrines, some contain deeply spiritual reflections, as the writings of Fénelon, Pascal, Francis de Sales, and Thomas à Kempis. The same cannot be said of Cardinal Vaughan's "Month of Joseph," Liguori's "Glories of Mary," and similar manuals, which are simply dishonouring to Christ. Protestants have a far richer and purer heritage of saintly writings, but they do not allow them to supersede the reading and study of the Bible. That holy volume is their daily portion. In the Book of Common Prayer they possess a devotional book in the vulgar tongue to which Romanists have no counterpart. The living spiritual power and life of Protestantism is also shown by the immense religious literature which is ever issuing from the press, so that it has been calculated that more religious books are published in a year by England, Germany, and America than in Rome in half a century;[1] and these are chiefly connected with the study of God's Holy Word, with the person and work of the Redeemer, with the regulation of human conduct, and the furtherance of the kingdom of God in righteousness and truth.

Look at CHRISTIAN WORK AND ALMSDEEDS. Rome's workers are easily recognised. The various orders have a distinctive dress. They cannot go forth as

[1] Quirinus.

sisters of mercy, or monks, or nuns without the world knowing them. Very few Protestant workers can be thus recognised. Yet an Italian,[1] who took some trouble to understand English life, wrote recently, "England is the country in which charitable enterprise has attained the most enormous proportions, where the variety of philanthropic institutions, the perfection of their methods of working, the immensity of the sums at their disposal, are unequalled. The grandeur of the scale upon which they do things is the more remarkable that they have not the machinery of a vast and ancient body such as the Catholic Church to work with.... England is full of nuns, who, without taking vows and without abandoning their places in social life, fulfil exactly the same duties as the sisters of St. Vincent de Paul." Verily this testimony is true, and the fact is productive of a more far-reaching and healthy influence than that of men or women who are utterly separated from the experiences and sympathies of family life. Cardinal Manning acknowledged the same zeal in Protestant philanthropy and religious efforts. "All the great works of charity in England," he wrote, "have had their beginnings apart from the Church of Rome; for instance, the abolition of the slave-trade and of slavery. Not a Catholic, so far as I know, shared in this. France, Portugal, Brazil have been secretly

[1] Signor Ferrero.

or openly slave-trading till now (1890). The whole Temperance movement — it was a Quaker that made Father Mathew a total abstainer. The Act of Parliament to protect animals from cruelty was carried by a non-Catholic Irishman; the Anti-Vivisection Act also. The Acts to protect children from cruelty were the work of Dissenters. There are endless works for the protection of shop-assistants, women, children, overworked railway men, &c.; not one of these works was started by us; hardly a Catholic name is to be found in the reports."[1]

But the most decisive test of true sanctity is the simple honest one of MORALS. Where morals are defective there can be little true sanctity. A few individual saints do not constitute a holy Church. Many heretics have been personally men of a religious life. Pelagius, Arius, Nestorius, were men of reputed piety. The test of a Church's holiness and usefulness is the *general* character of its members—the widespread tone of justice and righteousness and purity with which it influences society. No Church or nation is without vicious and iniquitous members, without hypocrites and men of base and dishonourable lives. The question is as to the *general* character, not special instances. Tried by this test, unquestionably Protestant countries are much more moral than Romish countries.

[1] Purcell's "Life of Manning," p. 781.

Family life is purer in England than in Italy.[1] Rome itself was perhaps the most immoral city in Europe before the present monarchy was established, and that with an ecclesiastic to every hundred souls. Nothing is more revolting in some Roman Catholic countries than the severance between morals and devotions. Romanists themselves speak of it with sorrow. The Church's discipline is strong against what she chooses to call *heresy, i.e.* upon differences of opinion in religion, but lax as regards *morals.* Her light penances and easy indulgences and weak "attrition" make sinning a trifle in popular estimation, easy to be atoned for. The same persons who go from shrine to shrine and mass to mass can indulge in unbridled lust without fear. Cardinal Newman once wrote: "A bad Catholic . . . looks up to our Blessed Lady . . . he turns the truth to his own purpose — his own bad purpose, and he makes her his patroness and protectress against the penalty of sins which he does not mean to abandon. Hence the strange stories of highwaymen and brigands devout to the Madonna. . . . In their fairs and amusements . . . upon the doors of wine-shops will be paintings of the Blessed

[1] Dean Alford visited Rome in 1861 and wrote of it: "It is not too much to say that the present moral and religious state of Rome is a foul blot on modern Christendom, and hardly to be paralleled even among the darkest passages in the history of our race."— *Letters from Abroad,* p. 133. It is sad to know that if there is improvement it is due not to the Roman Church but to Revolution.

Virgin or St. Michael, or the souls in purgatory. Innocence and guilt, and what is between the two, all range themselves under the same banner; for even the *resorts of sin* will be made doubly frightful by the blasphemous introduction of some sainted patron."[1] Strange to say, Newman wrote this as a proof of popular Romish piety! Had he forgotten the teaching of our Blessed Lord on this fatal and deadly severance of morals from devotion?—"*Woe to you, Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites, who pay tithe of mint and anise and cummin, and have let alone the weightier things of the law, judgment and mercy and faith.*" "*Woe to you, Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites: because you are like to whited sepulchres, which outwardly appear to men beautiful, but within are full of dead men's bones and of all filthiness*" (Matt. xxiii. 23, 27, 28, D.). Protestantism could not be guilty of such an association of "Christ with Belial." Cannot Roman priests stop this awful practice of harlots and brigands seeking the help of Mary in furtherance of their vices and crimes?

And as the morals and holiness of Protestants are higher than those of Romanists, taken collectively as well as individually, so Protestant England is morally pre-eminent over Romish kingdoms, whether in the purity of her court, the freedom and patriotism of the people, the impartiality of the judges throughout the empire, and the lower

[1] Newman's Lectures, ix.

criminal averages of the population. It is vain to say that there are no saints in the Reformed Churches. Protestants believe in the apostolic usage of the word "saint" as a *character which all ought to possess*, and not as the specialty of a few, who need to be "canonised" in Rome before they can receive the name. Moreover, they would refuse with indignation to reckon Liguori, who wrote the "Glories of Mary," and Torquemada, the Dominican who presided over the Inquisition and its cruelties in Spain, amongst the saints of God. Surely souls are saintly in proportion as they have the *mind* of Christ, and follow the "*blessed steps of His most holy life.*"

NOTE.—On the subject of morals two charges are brought against Rome on substantial evidence: (1) that of sanctioning and making use of writings which have been proved to be spurious; and (2) of largely upholding those principles of Probabilism as taught by the Jesuits, which justify prevarication and untruthfulness under certain forms of temptation, or for the benefit of the Church. The first charge has been learnedly maintained by T. James, M.A., in his work "Bellum Papale," and of the latter some startling instances are given in the popular book "England's Danger," by Dr. Horton, pp. 75–79. Instances of both kinds of Roman untruthfulness are mentioned in this volume. Such wilful departures from the will of Him Who is "the Truth" place the morality of Rome infinitely below the morality of Protestantism.

XLIII

IS ROMANISM ADVANCING?

Q.—Is it true that the Church of Rome is rapidly increasing in the world?

A.—The question as to the present growth and advancement of the Church of Rome in the world is a complex one. Probably when the question is raised, most inquirers are thinking of England. It is well known that Rome's strongest efforts are directed to the conversion of this country. The Jesuits regard England as the key to the world, and believe that if they can but "subdue"[1] its free and noble people, there would be no nation able to resist their power. Hence an almost fanatical zeal has been aroused throughout the Roman Church to this end. Years ago prayers were offered and indulgences granted by the Pope for special intercessions to be made that England might be converted. The result, after many years, was so barren that Cardinal Manning thought it wise to let them drop. Dr. Vaughan has endeavoured to revive them, and has formed a special "Confraternity" for

[1] Cardinal Manning's word.

the purpose.[1] The Italian mission to this country has received much indirect support from the banishment of the Jesuit Orders from France, most of whom took refuge in free and tolerant England. These have built extensive monasteries, nunneries, and seminaries throughout the land. Tens of thousands of manuals and controversial catechisms have been disseminated far and wide. This concentration of effort may well cause every Englishman to study his Bible with renewed prayer and pains, following the direction of St. Peter: "*Being always ready to satisfy every one that asketh you a reason of that hope which is in you*" (1 Peter iii. 15, D.). But the attack affords no ground for alarm to any one who takes up the "*sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God*" (Eph. vi. 17, D.). There is no promise that England shall be captured, like Jericho, by the mere sound of trumpets, nor by stratagem, as Ai. All the boasting of priests and cardinals cannot overcome the testimony of facts. Take the marriage statistics, which are the truest index of the growth or decline of the religious bodies, and add to these the confessions of Romanists themselves. The Roman marriages, which were at the rate of 51 per 1000 in the year 1853, have gradually fallen to only 41 in 1895—the last registrar's return—showing

[1] The Arch-Confraternity of our Lady of Compassion, for the Conversion of England.

a decided decrease in Roman marriages, which cannot be denied.

The confessions of Romanists at their own meetings and in their own literature point to the same results.

At the Wigan Roman Catholic Conference, 1891, the Right Rev. Abbot Snow said: "We cannot with any show of reason expect many conversions in the midst of the spiritual wreck and ruin that we see amongst Roman Catholics: we can scarcely dare to ask others to join a society of men of whom we ourselves are ashamed." At this Conference, Father Powell declared, "that while the population of London had increased by a million in twenty years, the number of Roman Catholics publicly baptized had only increased eleven annually."

The Rev. J. S. Mitchell, in the Roman *Catholic News*, August 1890, said: "We must not be under the impression that we gain ground. We are fast decreasing, and if we go on as we are, England will never be Roman Catholic. During the last forty years we have lost a million souls."

The Rev. F. Powell, 1891, at the Wigan Conference, said that since the days of Elizabeth "never had the prospects of the Church been darker than at present; they might set down Roman Catholics as a little under five per cent. of the total population. If this increase had been on a par with the general increase, they would have

added to their numbers one hundred and seventy-five thousand. But the melancholy truth was that in many parts of England their numbers were on the decrease. The two main causes of the loss were the aversion of young men to marriage and apostasy."

The loudly-boasted increase, therefore, proves to be mistaken when subjected to these simple tests. She still parades Newman and Manning before the public eye, but she omits to mention the able and learned men who have left her fold, such as the learned and orthodox Dr. Döllinger, A. W. Hutton, who wrote once so strongly against Anglican Orders, and many others equally learned, some of whom who—with sadness be it said—on their discovery of the Roman errors, became Unitarian in their reaction against superstition; such as W. E. Addis, chief editor of the *Catholic Dictionary*, and Father L. M. Bayard Klein, Jesuit Professor of Physics, Dublin, who had undergone that awful training lately explained to English readers.[1] Rome's losses are not proclaimed in the public papers, but they are far greater than is generally known. Indeed, it has been calculated that, relatively to *population*, more Romish priests have become Protestants in the last fifty years than Protestant clergy have seceded to Rome.[2] Cardinal Manning many years

[1] *Nineteenth Century*, August 1897.
[2] S.P.C.K. Statistics.

ago reckoned the Roman Catholics in England at 1,400,000, and Cardinal Vaughan gave the same return in his pastoral.[1] Of these, about one million are Irish, 100,000 foreigners, and only 300,000 English. This stationary, if not retrogressive, condition applies equally to other English-speaking countries, where Rome is also making unprecedented efforts at perversion.

If, in spite of Rome's unparalleled aggressiveness in England, there has been no proportionable increase of Romanists, it is equally certain that there is a continual decrease of faith in distinctively Roman Catholic countries. Look at the LATIN RACES. By these are meant the nations of Italy, Spain, Portugal, and France, which are entirely Latin, and Belgium and Austria, which are partially so. Five of these are feeble nations, or beset with political difficulties and threatened with colonial losses.

France is strong only in proportion as she is secular, whilst her population is almost stationary. Evidently the Roman faith is opposed to political and national progress. The best of her sons and daughters, who ought to raise the tone of married life and purify society, are withdrawn into monasteries and nunneries. The Church increases in wealth until her own children turn against her and strip her of her property in self-defence. In all

[1] June 12, 1898.

these countries liberty and toleration are making ground. The light is entering, and Protestant places of worship have been opened recently. Several secessions have taken place since the decree of infallibility—the Old Catholics in Germany and Switzerland, a Reformed Church in Spain, another in Italy, a fourth among the Poles in the United States, a fifth in Mexico. A spirit of inquiry is taking place among the Romish priests in France; they are reading the Scriptures, and so many are leaving the Roman Church that the movement is spoken of as an "Exodus." Well might the Romanist, Dr. Barry, writing to the *Catholic Union Gazette* (February 1897), say: "The despair of the (Roman) Church are the so-called LATIN nations. I need not," he goes on to say, "dwell upon a painful and familiar subject." Why "painful"? Because these are the nations where Rome has held complete dominion; where Protestants could not build a church until a few years ago; where private judgment was unknown, and toleration regarded as a crime; where the Bible was a sealed book, and man's reason violated, and God's choicest gifts of conscience and personal access to Himself through the one Mediator, Jesus Christ, were trampled upon and superseded by tradition and idle ceremonies, weakening the national character, paralysing the mental powers, until by the violent action of revolution, as in Italy and France, a measure of

self-government was obtained. This freedom has been gained in spite of religion, not as the result of it—alas! too often at the sacrifice of religion altogether. Thus in France, out of 37,000,000, with only some 650,000 Protestants, no fewer than 7,500,000 returned themselves at a recent census as of no religion, and this Latin nation is called "the eldest son of the Church"! "Painful and *familiar*," for every one must know it.[1] Oh that men would ponder well this logical outcome, this *ripe development* of Romanism! Surely Romanists would do well to return to the plain teachings of God's Word, and Protestants not to trifle with a creed which produces such bitter fruit.

[1] Since the above was written a great awakening has taken place among the Germans in Austria: thousands are joining the Old Catholics and the Reformed Churches. There is much discontent also among the Romanists in the United States. Cuba also and the Philippine Islands have been ceded to a Protestant power. The following report relative to Spain, published by the Government in 1896, shows that in a population of about 19,000,000, no fewer than 8,727,519 persons profess no occupation. There are 91,227 professed mendicants (of whom 51,948 are females), 43,328 members of the clergy, and 28,549 nuns. The number of absolutely unlettered persons is 6,104,470, including 2,686,615 females. —Bædeker's "Spain," 1898, p. xxvi.

[The *Catholic Herald* of October 14, 1922, states that "One-and-a-half million Catholics have been lost to the faith in England in a century."

The Romanist paper, *The Universe*, November 8, 1919, quoting from a letter by Fr. J. Talbot Smith, and entitling it "A Bad Outlook" says, "The Church is in a bad way. The greatest bulwark, the German centre party, is gone. There is no Catholic strength in France. Catholicity in England never was at a lower ebb."]

XLIV

REASON AND CONSCIENCE

Q.—This account of Roman Catholic nations, so palpably true, is startling. Is Romanism really opposed to the free exercise of Reason and Conscience?

A.—It is no wonder that the question should be asked with a certain measure of surprise. A moment's reflection assures us that reason and conscience are the two grandest qualities in man, the two which raise him above the rest of the animal creation, which exalt him to the dignity of angels, and endue him with that sense of responsibility, power, and freedom which is his very birthright. That any society should venture to interfere with their exercise would seem impossible, for it is an interference with the gifts and government of God. It should also be noticed that reason and conscience are not only the highest characteristics of our nature, but that revelation requires us to use them as tests of what is true, and as safeguards against imposition. This applies to the whole of Scripture, while special portions emphasise their importance. The Book of

Proverbs is an appeal to reason; the Book of Psalms to conscience. Our Blessed Lord appealed to the exercise of reason in proof of His mission (John v. 32–39, D.), urging the examination of His *works*, of the testimony of *John Baptist*, and of the *Scriptures*. "*Search the Scriptures: for you think in them to have life everlasting: and the same are they that give testimony of Me*"(D.). The same appeal is made in the matter of His forgiving sin (Matt. ix. 4–6, D.), and of His resurrection (Luke xxiv. 39, D.); and again He lays it down as a *general* rule—"*And why, even of* YOURSELVES, *do you not judge that which is just?*" (Luke xii. 57, D.). Our Lord's appeals to the conscience are unceasing. The same may be said of the apostles. The Epistles to the Romans and Galatians are examples of close reasoning, and the principle is appealed to constantly—"*I speak as to wise men: judge ye* YOURSELVES *what I say*" (1 Cor. x. 15, D.). "*Despise not prophecies. But prove all things: hold fast that which is good*" (1 Thess. v. 20, 21, D.).

But what is Rome's position as to these gifts and endowments so solemnly imparted to man? She allows private judgment to a Protestant in choosing to forsake the faith of his fathers and to become a Romanist, but once a Romanist her voice is changed! The following is the teaching of a book called "The Church and the Sovereign Pontiff," published with the assent of the two Roman Archbishops of Ireland and the other bishops (the italics are copied, p. 135):

"*It is necessary to believe, without examining, what the Church teaches, without adding or retrenching anything,* as her teaching cannot deceive." The same book lays down certain rules of orthodoxy: "1st Rule. To entirely renounce one's own judgment, and be ready to promptly obey the true Spouse of our Lord Jesus Christ, that is, the holy hierarchical Church, our mother;" and the 13th rule is similar: "Lastly, to be secured from all error, we should always be disposed to believe that that which seems white to us is black, if the hierarchical Church so decide." Dr. Bagshawe is scarcely less explicit: "By your profession of faith . . . you mean to express that you personally believe and accept all her (Rome's) teaching; that you submit your judgment on all religious matters to the decisions which she has given, and to all those *which she may hereafter give;* and that you acknowledge the (Roman) Catholic Church to have a right, given by God, to *command you in all that relates to your salvation.*"[1] Such are the necessary consequences of a belief in infallibility—in that "claim of the Pope to sequestrate all our God-given faculties for detecting error and discovering truth." Nor need it be wondered at that such demands to stifle reason and conscience should be made on the ordinary members of the Roman Church, when it is remembered that the education of those who enter the sacred "Order of Jesus," better known

[1] "Threshold of the Catholic Church," pp. 58, 59.

as Jesuits, imposes this destruction of reason and conscience as its essential requirement. Thus in their "Spiritual Exercises" the candidate is instructed, "I ought to desire to be ruled by a superior who endeavours to subjugate my judgment or subdue my understanding;" again, "When it seems to me that I am commanded by my superior to do a thing against which my *conscience revolts as sinful*, and my superior judges otherwise, it is my duty to yield my doubts to him, unless I am constrained by evident reasons;" again, "*I ought not to be my own, but His who created me* (so far well), *and his too by whose means God* (?) *governs me, yielding myself to be moulded in his hands like so much wax. . . . I ought to be like a corpse, which has neither will nor understanding, or like a small crucifix, which is turned about at the will of him that holds it.*" Under the influence of this teaching, Cardinal Manning wrote that an appeal to history—to the teaching of the early Church—was "a treason and a heresy."[1] Very different was the conviction of one of the most devout and intellectual of English statesmen. In a letter from Mr. Gladstone to Dr. Manning the following passage occurs: "After thirty years of the blasts of life, I remain rooted as much as before in regard for authority, and even more than before in the value I set upon freedom. It has pleased God, at a heavy cost, to give it the place of a foundation-stone in the being of man, the

[1] "Temporal Mission of the Holy Ghost," p. 226.

most wonderful of His known works. The difficulty of training and rearing it aright I feel; but under no inducement whatever could I, without treason to duty, consent, whether in religious or secular affairs, to its being trodden underfoot. And hence, while my creed is what it was, and perhaps even more sacramental, I regard with misgivings, which approach to horror, what may be called sacerdotalism. In this sacerdotalism I recognise a double danger: first, that many elect and tender souls may forego one of the great prerogatives and duties of their nature; secondly, that the just reaction from their excess, co-operating with other causes less legitimate, may yet more estrange the general mass of humanity from God and from religion." [1]

In vain does Father Ryder say that the "*function of reason is intellectually to assimilate the teaching of authority, not to question its truth*"; [2] and Father Maurel affirms that the Roman Pontiff is "*the regulator of consciences.*" [3] The dangers anticipated by Mr. Gladstone have judicially come to pass. Weak characters and tender souls fall into the snare of supposing that they can transfer their responsibility to priests, and they learn from them to occupy their minds, not with the patient study of God's Word, which ennobles the character, but with the endless diversions of saints and relics, privileged altars, and

[1] Purcell's "Life of Manning," vol. ii. p. 408.
[2] p. 174. [3] The Sovereign Pontiff, p. 73.

new cults, as that of Joseph or the Sacred Heart, obtaining a fictitious rest by a blind submission to some human authority. Intellectual men too often become estranged from God and from religion, and the reason, by being divorced from the highest themes of spiritual investigation, becomes debased, or fastens exclusively on material things. National decay follows the individual loss of manly vigour and high purpose. The revolutionary Roman Catholic Republics of South America, and the insurrections in the Spanish dependencies, are logical results of this stifling of reason and conscience and of the moral weakness which it engenders.

Some years ago a Roman Catholic called upon the writer requesting to be admitted into the Church of England. He gave as his motive that he had sacrificed his reason to the Roman Church, and was further expected to sacrifice his conscience. Against this his whole being rebelled. After a year's probation he was received, and the joy which he experienced on his recovery from mental and spiritual slavery was a rich compensation for the grave temporal loss which it involved.

The subject is a serious one. Let the thoughtful Romanist weigh it calmly and prayerfully. It has been truly said, "A man may save himself some present thought and trouble by resolving to believe blindly whatever Rome tells him, but he cannot destroy the natural obligations of a reasonable

creature nor blot out the positive command of God."[1] Let the words of St. Peter before the council be duly pondered: "*If it be just in the sight of God to hear you rather than God, judge ye*" (Acts iv. 19, D.).

[1] Scudamore's Letters.

XLV

A "LIVING VOICE"

Q.—The constant boast that Rome has a "Living Voice" to settle all questions of religion and interpretations of Scripture is a great attraction to many. Is the boast, or the assertion contained in it, to be relied upon?

A.—The boast is specious and attractive: weak and troubled Protestants have sometimes been misled by it to their *sorrow*, for no greater DELUSION was ever invented. By a "living voice" is evidently meant an audible voice, a voice that replies vocally or in writing, so that the solution to any religious difficulty should be obtainable *promptly* and *infallibly*: anything less than this would be no more than is given by every branch of the Catholic Church. Indeed, to hear some speak of it, one would think that a letter to the Pope on any question of ambiguity in doctrine or morals would receive an infallible reply by return of post. Mark that an opinion from any one else would be useless, as infallibility is now decided to pertain only to the Pope. He alone, according to the teaching of

modern Rome, is taught by the Holy Ghost, and only speaks infallibly when he speaks *ex cathedrâ*. The perplexed soul may consult the priest, but he is fallible; or he may consult the bishop, but he too may be mistaken; and as to reaching the Pope in the expectation of a reply in any reasonable time, the hope is utterly imaginary and delusive. The Pope has only *professed* to speak infallibly twice in the present century, and many Romanists are doubtful as to the *conditions* of an infallible utterance. Certain it is that the announcements made on those occasions as to the "Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary" and the "Infallibility of the Pope" are positively misleading, being contrary alike to Scripture and reason. But how can a voice that is often silent for centuries be a "living voice," audible and prompt? Look at the question of transubstantiation. It was discussed for centuries, and not decided by Rome until the Lateran Council in the thirteenth century. A century elapsed before the "living voice" settled the dispute between the Jansenists and the Jesuits. In like manner centuries passed before the "living voice" decided upon the immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary; and again eighteen centuries elapsed before it was settled where in the Roman Church the seat of infallibility was to be found! At the present time Romanists have their burning questions on which the "living voice" refuses to speak, or dares

not, or most probably cannot. The Jesuits wish to have Liguori's theory of Probabilism accepted as a dogma of the Roman Church; other Romanists denounce it as opposed to morality. Why does not the "living voice" settle a question so hotly disputed by her most learned members, and on which the moral teaching of her communion so largely depends? Then there is a question which daily troubles thousands of bereaved hearts, high and low, rich and poor, viz., as to the length of time their departed friends and relatives are to suffer in purgatory. Rome asserts that she has the power of "binding and loosing without any reservation, and in this power is contained authority not only over the guilt of sin, but *also over the punishment due to it.*"[1] How does she exercise this? By all sorts of indulgences, extending over days or years, which the mourner can earn from the Pope by the observance of certain feasts, by recitation of prayers, by pilgrimages, crosses, relics, and rosaries, and, above all, by masses. But the mourner never knows when full satisfaction has been made! The sad heart hears the "living voice" say: "Buy masses; leave money for masses; visit shrines, &c. &c.; make offerings to the Church, merit indulgences"; but the "voice" is dumb as to the one longing of the aching heart: "When will my child, my wife, my husband be released from those pains of purga-

[1] "Threshold of the Catholic Church," p. 232.

tory, which you often describe as equivalent to the pains of hell?" No wonder many accuse her in bitterness, and with much seeming justice, that she is more eager for money than for the relief of souls. (For other instances of the silence of this "living voice" see pages 51, 59, 237, 301, 347.) But the whole matter is contrary to the Divine procedure.

When the rich man in Hades asks for a special messenger to be sent to warn his brethren as a sure mode of convincing them, the reply was, "*If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded if one rose from the dead.*" God has provided always sufficient grace and opportunity for man's instruction and salvation. As St. Peter expresses it, "*He has given us all things that pertain for life and godliness.*" He has provided for our safety, not for our curiosity; for the exercise of thought, study of His Word, intelligence, conscience, not for ease and laziness. He tests our integrity, our earnestness, our sincerity. He disciplines our life and faith and conduct by the necessity for patience and thought and prayer. If every spiritual difficulty could be settled instantly by reference to an organisation existing outside of us, all the benefits of discipline, inquiry, responsibility, humility, and reverence, would be lost. Whatever we might be in other matters, we should in the highest part of our nature be mere automatons, spiritual machines, ultimately unfit and incompetent to enjoy the high spiritual fellowship

of saints and angels in heaven. As well claim that every prayer should be answered by an audible voice, every petition to God receive an unmistakable reply. God's dealing with us relative to prayer is His Divine method in all questionings of the soul.

Yet there is a "Living Voice" which the Church of Rome virtually ignores and sometimes contradicts, the voice of Him who said, "*I am He that liveth and was dead: and behold, I am* ALIVE FOR EVERMORE" (Rev. i. 18).

THE TRUE LIVING VOICE IS JESUS CHRIST.—The Church was never meant to be a perpetual oracle of Divine truth to answer every question that may arise. She is not so much a living voice as a living witness to a once-spoken voice. The disloyalty of souls to the voice of the Lord Jesus Christ would be amazing if it were not so common. We have His own words spoken when on earth, and in the Epistles we have His teaching, communicated, according to His promise, through the Holy Ghost, *bringing all things to the remembrance* of the apostles, *taking of the things of Christ* in their greater fulness, and causing them to be written for the perpetual instruction of His people. If His disciples would now listen to His voice, there would be few questions of importance that would be without reply. Hear how the true "Living Voice" addresses the penitent believing sinner: "*Son* (*daughter*), *thy sins are forgiven thee.*" See how He invites inquiring and questioning

hearts: "*Come to Me, all you that labour and are heavy laden, and I will refresh you*" (Matt. xi. 28, D.). "*Jesus said to them, I am the bread of life; he that cometh to Me shall not hunger, and he that believeth in Me shall never thirst.*" "*Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that believeth in Me hath everlasting life*" (John vi. 35, 47). Again, "*He that hath the Son hath life;*" "*Because I live ye shall live also;*" "*Whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in My name, He shall give it you;*" and "*Hitherto have ye asked nothing in My name: ask, and ye shall receive, that your joy may be full.*"

From the infallible "Living Voice" of Christ there is the full declaration of pardon and peace to the believing soul, whether in life or at the hour of death; even to the robber and murderer, who had no time for penance or good works, only time to confess his Lord, the "Living Voice" said, "*To-day shalt thou be with Me in paradise.*" When persons crave for a "living voice" beyond that of the Lord Himself and of those whom He inspired to declare His mind in the New Testament, it is a sign of spiritual disease, of impatience and unbelief, generally the result of an imperfect study of the Scriptures. They "do err," for the reason which our Saviour gave to the Pharisees, "*not knowing the Scriptures nor the power of God*" (Matt. xxii. 29, D.). In all these sayings of our Blessed Lord and countless others, not one points to Pope or Council—all direct the soul to personal faith, union, and fellowship in and with the Lord Jesus Christ Himself.

XLVI

WHAT GOOD HAS ROMANISM DONE IN THE PAST?

Q.—In spite of her errors, has not the Church of Rome been productive of many Benefits to mankind?

A.—Doubtless much good has been done through her instrumentality. It would be terrible to suppose that Christianity had ever so far failed as to lose all power to benefit mankind. However the light of the Gospel may have been dimmed, that light has never been extinguished. It has been shown that for nearly four centuries she was orthodox in faith and zealous in spreading the kingdom of Christ, and when erroneous doctrines crept in, they were not at once universally received. Few of the present distinctive doctrines of Rome date earlier than the tenth century; nor must it be forgotten that she has always received the three Creeds which contain all things absolutely necessary to salvation. Her great fault is and has been (1) that of imposing new and unscriptural doctrines upon her members, and (2) seeking the advancement of the Papacy as an earthly monarchy rather than the promotion of

the spiritual kingdom of Christ in the conversion and moral elevation of all her children. The benefits which have occurred under her sway redound not rightfully to her honour, but to the credit of the intrinsic and unquenchable power of the Gospel of God.

Among the benefits of her ancient power may be traced the old Roman spirit of endurance and discipline, "which," writes Dr. Wace, "enabled her after Gregory the Great to subdue the fierce energies of the barbaric hordes which overran Europe, and to bring the wild passions of the Teutonic races under the control of the Christian law. Monks and schoolmen performed prodigies of self-denial to impress the rules of Christian life upon the world." Whilst this strictness lasted, the Church did a noble work, but it was impaired by the laxity of immoral Popes, by the doctrines of purgatory, indulgences, and masses, which were introduced about the tenth century.

Again, in the dark ages, when feudal lords were perpetually at war, and land after land reeked with violence and bloodshed, the monasteries were refuges for the oppressed, for those who wished to live godly lives, for the delicate, the refined, and pure-hearted —for God never left Himself without a witness in the world. To these refuges, which even the vile regarded as sacred, many a wearied and wicked man or woman retired after a life of violence or

wrong for penitence and prayer. So, too, in those ages of popular ignorance, when many of the nobles could not write their names, these monasteries were the only safe receptacles for manuscripts and copies of the Word of God, for the writings of the Fathers, and other classical and learned works. Some of the monks made copies of these priceless treasures, and edited them with care; others tampered with them for controversial ends, but Europe gratefully acknowledges their preservation in centuries of ignorance and peril. Certain monasteries were famous for devout and saintly men, such as Clairvaux, the home of St. Bernard, and Bec, where two Archbishops of Canterbury — Lanfranc and Anselm—were trained. The cathedrals also were erected for the most part when Popes were supreme in Western Europe—those marvellous ideals of art, beauty, and worship. Nor should it be doubted that God in every age has had sincere and even saintly worshippers in the Church of Rome, whose piety and devotion had their root—not in her corruptions, not in what is now distinctively Roman as such—but in those doctrines which are primitive and Catholic, and which Protestants hold in their original purity. The Reformation took its rise from such as these, and in God's good time another Reformation in faith and doctrine may again take place.

But much of the Roman system is now an

anachronism. Universal religious toleration renders sanctuaries and refuges unnecessary. Colleges and universities have taken the place of sacerdotal seminaries with narrow and partial sympathies; public libraries store up the literature of the world and place it within the reach of every student; reason and conscience are everywhere reasserting themselves; universal philanthropy among the laity as a kingdom of priests no longer restricts the care of the sick and poor to orders of monks and nuns. Rome has no grip of national life, which everywhere languishes under her influence. Thirty monasteries have been erected in Madrid in about as many years, but the lessons of "*judgment, mercy, and faith*" (Matt. xxiii. 23, D.), with the duty of government to create a free and happy people at home or in the colonies, have been passed by. The priest's lips do not "utter knowledge;" they are too occupied with unprofitable sacerdotal functions to teach the one grand political motto of revelation, that "*righteousness exalteth a nation, and that sin is the reproach of any people.*"[1] The Church is again massing up wealth, erecting high-walled buildings and adding field to field, but, as of old, it will end in confusion and unbelief.

The Church of Rome may exist for centuries yet to come, a refuge for those who shun responsibility, to their moral degradation, and accept "authority"

[1] Prov. xiv. 34. The Douay version is striking—"Justice exalteth a nation; but sin maketh nations miserable."

without inquiry—a system pleasing to those worldly natures who, if there must be a religion, prefer one that admits the enjoyment of all the gaieties of life —and not a few of its vices—on the condition of penances aided by indulgences and masses—to that genuine religion of Christ which demands conversion of heart and character in this life. Saints also may spring up in sheltered places and under spiritual priests who bemoan their Church's errors, but have not courage to leave her fold, and pray on for better days. None pity her so earnestly as many Protestants who recognise the good done in her early history, and behold the zeal and enthusiasm which, exerted on Scriptural lines, might restore the character of the Latin nations—wasted upon the hopeless task of bringing back the Anglo-Saxon races to the bondage and errors from which Christ has made them free.

XLVII

PRESENT ATTITUDE OF ROME TOWARDS ENGLISH PROTESTANTISM

Q.—Is not the attitude of Rome towards English Protestantism considerably modified at the present time?

A.—There are several instances in which such modification appears to have taken place. Some have been already given. Thus the reading of the Bible, though discouraged, is not forbidden in Protestant, as in purely Romish countries.[1] On the dogma that there is "No salvation out of the Roman Church," Cardinal Manning mentions with a measure of approval Augustine's saying: "Many sheep without, and many wolves within"[2] the Church, and argues it from his knowledge of English Christians. "I have known intimately souls living lives of visible sanctification, as undoubtedly the work of the Holy Ghost as I have ever seen, in all conditions of life. How can men go on speaking of those out of the (Roman) Church in England as in the state

[1] See pp. 91, 94, and Note, p. 361.

[2] "Multæ oves foris, multi lupi intus."

of nature and in bad faith, and to be avoided as immoral? There are no doubt such persons among them. But what is the state of France, Italy, Spain, South America? All the light and grace of the Catholic Church is in vain for multitudes in those Catholic countries."[1] The Cardinal was, perhaps, turning back to his earlier and better days in the Church of England when he wrote these words. The evident working of the Holy Spirit among Protestants was too much for him, as for many other pious Romanists in the present day: the convictions of conscience cannot be extirpated altogether, in spite of the general teaching of the Church of Rome. Again, as regards *direct prayers to saints for gifts and blessings*, we have seen how this doctrine is kept back from manuals intended for English use, and the custom represented as no more than asking their prayers in our behalf as Christians ask the prayers and intercessions of friends who are alive.[2] Another modification is the permission to converts to regard "*Pieties*"—by which is meant the veneration of images, relics, and the like—as "not-essential,"[3] with a remarkable statement as to miracles: "There is not any miracle, except those recorded in Scripture, which is a matter of faith. Miracles rest each on its own evidence, and *you can believe them or not*, as you think that they

[1] Purcell's "Life of Manning," vol. ii. p. 781.
[2] Pp. 217, 227, 229. [3] "Threshold," &c., 224.

are or are not proved"; and further, as to "Confraternities, scapulars, and other devotional practices in use in the (Roman) Church, I have to observe that none of their rules bind under pain of sin" ("Threshold," p. 229). A still more important modification was made at the consecration of Cardinal Wiseman as Archbishop of Westminster. The oath usually taken by Roman bishops at consecration, and by archbishops on receiving the pallium, contains the clause: "All heretics, schismatics, and rebels against the same our Lord the Pope, I will persecute and attack." This oath, Dr. Wiseman explained, is left out from the oath when taken in the special case of "bishops under the English crown."[1] Rome's modern language on persecution is also changed. Excuses are made for the Inquisition and other cruelties to Protestants on the plea of the roughness and violence of the age, and that similar cruelties were inflicted for civil crimes, with assurances that the altered times do not admit of such possibilities. So far are the "modifications" carried, or "omissions," as some of them are more correctly called, that the doctrine of Transubstantiation even is omitted in Cardinal Gibbons' "Faith of our Fathers"—a book specially written to win over unwary Protestants. The "Month of Mary" is not mentioned in the "Manual of Catholic Belief," which has the imprimatur

[1] Notes on the Cardinal's Manifesto by Dr. Cumming, p. 6.

of Cardinal Manning; nor does it contain any mention of the worship of the Sacred Heart or of pilgrimages. These and other modifications, or omissions, of distinctively Roman doctrines are to be found in many manuals intended for England and her colonies, but in Roman Catholic countries the cults of Mary, Joseph, and the Sacred Heart are promoted with a zeal and fervour beyond all bounds.

NOTE.—A remarkable notice has just been brought to the writer's knowledge. *Le Canoniste Contemporain*, April 1899 (Paris), announces, "Indulgences pour le lecture de l'Evangile," in an official form, the petition in French, the decree in Latin. The decree grants an indulgence of one hundred days to the faithful who spend a quarter of an hour daily in reading the Gospel in some authorised translation, and a plenary indulgence to those who read it the same amount of time daily for a month—the indulgences are stated to be applicable to the souls in Purgatory. It is a strange mingling of truth and error. May the truth of God's Holy Word shortly banish the error of human tradition. It is at least a most encouraging step in the right direction.

XLVIII

IS ROME BEING REFORMED FROM WITHIN?

Q.—Then may we not indulge the hope, which some have entertained from these seeming modifications of her doctrine, that Rome is being Reformed from Within?

A.—Many sincere Romanists, and not Protestants only, have endeavoured so to regard these modifications or concessions, and to hope that Rome is being, unconsciously to herself it may be, reformed and brought into closer agreement with Holy Scripture and the mind of Christ; nor can we tell whether it may not be God's will to work a permanent return to apostolic teaching from these subtle adaptations of Rome's teachers for temporal ends. "Man proposes and God disposes." Rome's method of attracting Protestants may prove to be God's method of enlightening Romanists.

At present it is clear that the modifications which have been mentioned are not intended to lead to any surrender of Roman doctrines. (1.) No Roman doctrine of Trent is denied; the instances are *evasions or omissions, for a purpose and for a time.* (2.)

They occur in books intended mainly for Protestants, and are given grudgingly,[1] adapted to the Protestant state of mind, knowledge, and reason. The words in the episcopal oath and the enactments against heretics are in abeyance from necessity; they have *not been repealed.* The admission that non-Romish members of Christ's Church may be saved is doubtless graceful and sincere in the writings of some Romanists, but what can be said of the Jesuits at Ware—the educators of Rome's future priests for England—in the newspaper which they edit, called the *Universe*, and in which they wrote of the late Canon Jenkins as "that wretched old sophist and blasphemer to the very end of his long life"; and in the same periodical some time after the death of Archbishop Benson, they describe him as "an old heretic, absolutely hung round with a catena of interdicts and excommunications, whose sole hope of salvation rests upon a miraculous, invincible ignorance of God's truth."[2] These educators of Rome's priests do not manifest much piety or toleration. The omission of transubstantiation in Cardinal Gibbons' article on the Eucharist can signify no disbelief in the doctrine, no change with regard to it, or he would be speedily silenced by the Curia. But Pope and Curia are willing to conceal for a time those points which offend England's higher and

[1] See "Threshold," pp. 224, 225, 237.

[2] See Numbers for February 1897 and November 28, 1896.

nobler Christianity; a present nominal conversion on easy conditions will satisfy, provided that Rome may have the future education of their children. These evasions of repulsive doctrines are *for a time* and *for a purpose*, otherwise they would be as widely observed and practised in Roman as in Protestant countries.

Let Protestants beware of these temporary adaptations. Many pious Romanists admit that they are unreal, and grieve over the apparent hopelessness of doctrinal and spiritual reform. Rome's recent dogma of infallibility has closed the door of hope. With sorrow but with truth, be it said, her members can only obtain deliverance by seeking grace and courage from the Holy Spirit, the Spirit of Truth, to COME OUT AND TO BE SEPARATE.

[The present day attitude of Rome to Protestantism is clear from the following extracts—many others could be given.

Father Hugh Pope (*Glasgow Citizen*, April 24, 1922) is reported to have said, "The 'old gentleman down below' must indulge in many chuckles; but he thought that of all the things over which he chuckled one must be Protestantism."

Father H. Lester, S.J. (*Universe*, March 9, 1923), "We have said before, and we say it again—Protestantism isn't a religion, it is a disease."

Cardinal Vaugham (*The Minister*, January 1896, p. 56), "The Catholic Church is the only true Church of Christ"—therefore all other religious organisations are simply human and possibly Satanic.]

XLIX

ROME'S ENGLISH MARTYRS

Q.—Romanists frequently speak of their "English martyrs," and say that as many Romanists suffered for their religion under Elizabeth as Protestants under Mary. Is this correct?

A.—This statement is very far from being correct. As regards the Protestants who suffered under Henry VIII. and Mary, they were martyrs in the truest sense of the word. The very death inflicted upon them testifies that they suffered for religion, for doctrine, for the truth which they felt to be dearer than life. They suffered by *burning*, by faggot and flame, which is in itself a proof that those who condemned them regarded them not as traitors to king or country—for that would have brought them to the *axe*, not to the *faggot*—but as dying for their faith. Romanists may say they suffered for heresy; that is a matter on which opinions may vary; at least they cannot deny that they died for their *faith*. Most of them suffered on the same charges as Archbishop Cranmer, that is, for denying transubstantiation and the real objective presence of Christ's body and blood

in the elements of bread and wine, and for disbelieving the efficacy of masses for the living and the dead; in other words, for believing that the one sacrifice for sins once offered by our Lord Jesus Christ upon the cross was sufficient in merit and efficacy for the sins of the whole world. The Romanists who suffered under Henry, Edward, and Elizabeth suffered not by faggot and burning, but by execution—by the axe—the then recognised penalty of *treason,* not of religion. Had Archbishop Cranmer and the Protestants chosen to retaliate for their brethren who had suffered martyrdom under Henry VIII., they could easily have done so under Edward VI., but they refused to do so. Intolerant as the age was, the Protestants did not retaliate, though they had the power. In like manner, no Romanists suffered for their religion under Elizabeth. They suffered, not by faggot for religion, but by execution as traitors against the Queen. Pope Pius V. (A.D. 1570) had excommunicated Queen Elizabeth and absolved all Romanists from their allegiance. The result was a succession of plots against the government and life of the Queen, which brought many to the scaffold. Two hundred and eighty-eight Protestants suffered for their *faith* and their *religion* in the *five* years of Mary's reign; two hundred only in the *forty-five* years of Elizabeth's for *conspiracy and treason.* That this was the true and only cause can be gathered from the testimony of Romanists.

The English Roman Catholics under Elizabeth, addressing the Pope with regard to the severe penal laws which oppressed them, laid the whole blame on the Jesuits, as having provoked it by their conspiracies; while the secular priests in England issued in 1601, by the pen of one of their members, William Watson, a pamphlet, known as "Important Considerations," to the same effect.[1]

The excuses which Roman writers offer to palliate the cruelties of Mary and the agonies of the thousands who suffered under the Inquisition, in the massacre of St. Bartholomew, and at other painful historic persecutions, are mere evasions. They plead that when the inquisitors delivered a heretic to the civil authorities that he might be burnt, they bespoke compassion for the condemned man, and begged that they would keep him "unharmed in life and limb." This prelude to the scene of the last tragedy of the *auto da fé* has been truly called "a fiendish piece of irony," for they had educated the civil authorities to burn heretics, and by the Canon Law they exacted this obedience.[2] If they had disapproved of the civil

[1] Dr. Milner, with his usual audacity, entirely contradicts all history. He writes: "Above two hundred (Roman) Catholics were hanged, drawn, and quartered during her (Elizabeth's) reign, for the *mere* profession or exercise of the religion of their ancestors for a thousand years." Never was a greater falsehood put in print (Letter lxvi.).

[2] See Bull of Pius V., Ann. 1566.

process, they could have instantly stopped it by threat of excommunication, or the like. It may be said more truly that if the civil authorities had not burnt the so-called "heretic" they would themselves have been accused on suspicion of heresy and condemned.

Modern Roman controversialists attribute these cruelties to the coarseness of the times, and profess to regard them as things of the past, yet they often betray a liking for the same persecuting and repressive power, or condemn it with bated breath, accusing Protestants of indifference to truth, alleging, "If Protestants are in the abstract advocates of universal toleration, this is because they do not believe in any objective certainty of religious truth."[1] Had the writer forgotten that Protestants hold the Creeds of the undivided Church and the Word of God? They believe in the certainty of religious TRUTH, not in the uncertainties of tradition and of a creed drawn up by Pope Pius IV. fifteen hundred years after Christ. It is not *truth* but *error* that persecutes. Rome has yet to study and understand the reply of Jesus to the disciples when they wished to call down fire from heaven on those who differed from themselves. "*And turning, He rebuked them, saying, You know not of what spirit you are. The Son of Man came not to destroy souls, but to save*" (Luke ix. 56, D.).

[1] Historical Papers, p. 3.

L

ALLEGED FAILURES OF PROTESTANTISM

Q.—Rome is constantly charging Protestantism with *failure.* Is there any truth in the accusation?

A.—By no means so much as there would be in bringing the same charge against Romanism. It should be remembered that our Lord forewarned His disciples that defects, corruption, errors, schisms, and persecutions would from time to time arise in the visible Church. In the parable of the tares He compares the "kingdom of heaven," or the visible Church, to a field in which the enemy had sown tares, and affirms that the "*wheat and the tares must grow together until the harvest*" (Matt. xiii. 28–30). It is quite true that the "gates of hell" shall never *prevail* against the Church Universal, but there may be, and there have been, serious losses and damaging assaults. Where are the three hundred bishoprics of Northern Africa? Have the Crusades, which Rome instigated with so much fervour, borne any permanent fruit? Is it wise, "considering those that are without," for the several Churches to throw

out taunts of failure against one another? The writer takes up the subject not willingly, but as St. Paul said to the Corinthians, "*You have compelled me to it*" (2 Cor. xii. 11, D.). Let the chief charges[1] be considered honestly.

One charge of failure against Protestants is that "they are not Aggressive, and make no Conquests." Now, seeing that up to the revolutionary epoch of 1848 many Romish countries positively refused to allow Protestants to hire rooms for divine service, much less to erect churches, and excluded copies of the Bible, and in some cases were with difficulty persuaded to grant land for their Christian burial, it is not very strange that Protestants could not be "aggressive and make conquests." Take the instance of Spain. The Reformation of the sixteenth century was crushed out by the action of the Inquisition, and thousands were burnt or imprisoned. Up to the year 1868 it was an offence punishable by the civil law to hold a Protestant service for Spaniards. How could Protestants be "aggressive and make conquests" under such circumstances? This persecuting intolerance has now in some measure been broken down, with the result that there is now a Reformed Church, with its bishop, twelve congregations, and ten schools, and the movement is increasing. In Italy there was the like exclusion and

[1] These charges are taken from Stone's book, "The Invitation," &c.

intolerance until the Revolution; now many Protestant services are held by Italians, and a desire is being largely expressed to have their own bishop. What would Romanists have said if England and the United States had been as intolerant as they? It would be as absurd to blame a chained prisoner for not running a race as to accuse Protestants of sloth in seeking to convert Romanists until the last half century. Probably they may regret ere long that they have stimulated Protestant zeal by such a rash accusation.

To judge of Protestant activity, where it has been possible, its victories, quiet and progressive, must be marked in the colonial expansion of the Anglo-Saxon races. The advance of the NON-Roman Churches is grand and mighty in its noiseless onward march. It needs no prophetic power to foresee that the future growth of Christianity lies, not with Rome, but with the Protestantism of the English-speaking peoples.

As another instance of failure, it is asserted that "Protestantism does not reach the masses." To prove this, highly-coloured pictures are drawn of Romanists of the labouring classes rising early on Sunday morning to attend mass. But the artist does not go on to describe how these persons spend the rest of the Sunday in buying and selling, in games and pleasure, at races and theatres, and the like, if within their reach. It omits the terrible

separation in the mass of Romanists between so-called "*devotions*" and the real worship of God "in spirit and in truth"—between religious *forms* easily observed and genuine obedience to the laws and will of God. Morals, without such external "devotions," are infinitely better than "devotions" without morals, for this is either hypocrisy or self-deception. The most criminal cities in Great Britain are Liverpool and Glasgow, where Romanists reside in great numbers, and the most corrupt cities of the United States are New York and Chicago, where again Romanists are very numerous and influential. But the charge is largely grounded on ignorance of the millions of humble Protestants who attend adult Bible-classes and Mission-rooms; these take religion much more seriously than Romanists, and do not care to be present at services which they do not fully understand, or to profess more than they act up to.

After all, it is a question whether Romanism does reach the masses. If it does, how is it that so much is said about the "leakage" of the masses in Protestant countries? There is a contradiction in the two statements which refutes the charge. A Sunday in Paris, where the labouring workmen toil in the morning as on week-days, and where the Roman Catholic Church provides no Sunday evening services, destroys the picturesqueness and the accuracy of the boast.

Another failure attributed to Protestantism is that

of "ill-success in the conversion of the heathen." This is a charge founded on the assumed ignorance of those censured. No greater failures are recorded in the history of missions than those of the renowned Francis Xavier and his companions. They are said to have converted more than a million in China and Japan, yet a few years after their death scarcely a convert could be found, and the profession of Christianity became unlawful in those lands. The conversions were unreal—the effect of accommodating Christian worship to the heathen habits of the country, and final expulsion was the usual and necessary result of Jesuit intrigues in civil matters. Protestant missions are almost universal. No lands are left unreached. Their martyrs in the present century amount to a noble army. No portions of the Catholic Church are more active or their work more owned of God than those so ignorantly censured. A signal proof of this is the fact that the Protestant missions have translated the whole Bible or the New Testament into 240 *languages, that the native Churches may have God's Word in their own tongue. What has the Roman Church done in this matter?

One other failure is alleged: that "Protestantism develops into Rationalism and Naturalism." Doubtless these two "spirits of darkness" are attacking Christianity on all sides, but the accusation as against Protestantism is from a strange quarter when it comes from Rome. Does not the Pope continue to

* 1927, now 600 languages.

style France the "eldest son of the Church," and is not Roman Catholic France the only country in which not only is the Bible not read in her schools, but the very name of God has been erased from the class-books in her national education? This terrible instance is instructive.[1] It demonstrates that unbelief is far more the result of superstition than of logical and philosophic thought. "Free-thinkers" are known to be multiplying in Belgium, and even in the villages of many Romish countries. But no Protestant country ignores the Word of God, and the more fully, the more exclusively and truly, Christ is proclaimed in any Church, the more free is that Church from infidelity. The *corruptions* of Christianity are the offence, not the *true* Christ.

[1] See p. 339.

[In a letter to *The Times*, July 31, 1926, the Rev. T. J. Pulvertaft says, "Men are prosecuted in Spain and punished for singing hymns in their own houses; and public speakers have been forbidden to mention the Bible."

And yet the Protestant Bible is more read in China than Confucius, more read in India than the Vedas, more read in Italy than Virgil, more read in Greece than Homer."]

LI

ALLEGED IMMORAL EFFECTS OF THE REFORMATION

Q.—Romanists allege that the Reformers themselves testify to the looseness of morals and the increase of avarice and indulgence of the evil passions which followed the Reformation. How is this to be accounted for?

A.—The Reformers did most sorrowfully and boldly testify against the iniquities which burst forth like a flood at the time of the Reformation. Their courageous denunciations of the vices which prevailed prove that these vices were no fruit of evangelical or Protestant teaching, but that they arose from older and deeper causes. Tyranny, whether religious or political, is always followed by a reaction of violence and lawlessness. Our Lord unfolds a law by which the sins of generations are seen to accumulate until they reach a crisis, and judgment and sufferings come with a terrific and accumulated force (Luke xi. 50, D.): "*That the blood of all the prophets, which was shed from the foundation of the world, may be required of* THIS *generation.*" Such was the misery which attended the fall of Jerusalem—a

judgment brought on by the neglect of solemn prophetic warnings, and by a hollow profession of religion, in which ritual and immorality were closely allied. Such was the French Revolution. The Jesuits had had the almost exclusive education of the French nation for a century, but they had kept back the Word of God; they supported the tyranny of the nobles, slurred over the open immorality of the court, shared in the unjust exemption of the upper classes from the more burdensome taxes; the dignitaries of the Church were detested and despised. At last the oppression became unendurable. The cry of "Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity" burst from the people. Noble sentiments, but bought by the overthrow of all that was sacred—attained by atheism, not by the Christian faith, of which the people had no real knowledge; sung 'mid groans from the guillotine and tears of sorrowing innocents. What was the cause of that Revolution and its fearful consequences? Surely the wrongs inflicted upon the masses with the connivance and under the education of the Roman Church. It was a violent and ungovernable reaction which the genuine leaders were unable to control, and in which God's accumulated judgments were outpoured on a nation's accumulated sins, but from which order, freedom, and justice, finally emerged. So was it at the Reformation, especially in Germany. In England the public mind had been prepared more gradually,

and the excesses were proportionately fewer. But in every case the causes were the same. Petitions for reformation had been made in vain. The Papal Court turned a deaf ear to all complaints. The exactions of the Roman Church multiplied. Nearly one-third of the land in France had been absorbed by the Church, and even in greater proportion in some countries. The annual drain extracted by the Pope from England exceeded the income of the monarchy. Dissolute habits amongst the cardinals, the non-residence of bishops, the exclusive privileges demanded by all ecclesiastics, at last stirred up the hostility of princes and people. The false doctrines of Rome were being detected through the circulation of the Scriptures, thereby adding largely to the general discontent. All classes felt, some vaguely, all bitterly, that they were wronged; but their grievances received neither attention nor redress. It needed but a spark to throw everything into confusion. This was given by Tetzel's sale of indulgences, which roused the indignation of Luther and the German princes. Luther's strong honest character and uncompromising speech shook the Vatican. Brave and holy men came forth as leaders, but they could not control the storm of anger and bitterness which years of wrong had created. Passions long held in check only through fear, combined with a pent-up sense of injustice for which there had been no relief, broke down all forces and restraints. When

these had exhausted themselves, then the true principles of piety gradually prevailed, and the reformation in doctrine brought about a reformation in life and practice such as distinguishes Protestant nations and Churches at the present day. The evils which grieved the souls of the Reformers were not the result of the teaching which they delivered, but of the unlicensed freedom which followed years of spiritual bondage and corruption under the training of Papal Rome.

[What are the present day effects of Romanism? The Evangelical Union of South America affirms that in the South American States it is a fact that Bibles are burnt there to-day, that 75 per cent. of the people are illiterate, and that many of the priests are described by a Romanist paper as notoriously immoral and leading depraved lives.

In *The Daily Express* for January 26, 1927, Mr. E. Ashmead-Bartlett, writes as follows, "There are said to be 18 millions of illiterates among this nation (Italy) of 42 millions."

PART IV

SOME POPULAR ROMAN FALLACIES

LII

POPERY ON EVERY COIN OF THE REALM

Q.—Cheap tracts are being largely circulated by Romanists amongst the working-classes. There is one entitled, "Popery on every Coin of the Realm." How should it be dealt with?

A.—The title refers to the letters *F.D.* or *Fid. Def.* on our English money. They stand for two Latin words which mean "Defender of the Faith," and the title was given by Pope Leo X. to Henry VIII. for writing a book against Luther and in defence of the Papacy. The tract-writer [1] argues that they contain an admission of our having once been in union with Rome, and that we ought to submit to Rome now because we continue to use them. But what about the Pope's proud title, "Pontifex Maximus"? It is still claimed by him, yet every one knows it is the title which was used for centuries by the heathen and idolatrous head of the sacerdotal priesthood of Pagan Rome. By similarity of reasoning, therefore, the Popes by retaining this heathen title ought to be Pagans. Probably they would

[1] Tract 61.—*Catholic Truth Society.*

plead that the title reminds them of a gracious deliverance from former errors. So do Protestants feel when they see the letters "F.D.," and thankfully regard their monarchs no longer as defenders of Rome's mediæval errors, but of the "*faith once for all delivered to the saints*" (Jude 3).

LIII

ENGLAND CONVERTED BY ROMAN MISSIONARIES

Q.—Several of these popular tracts urge the obligation of Englishmen to become Romanists because (they allege) England was converted by the Roman missionary Augustine. Is this statement correct?

A.—Certainly not. If Protestants studied the religious history of their own countries as they ought to do, they would be surprised to find how few nations owe their conversion to Christianity to Roman missionaries. The conversion of our country may be broadly divided into two epochs.

First Epoch.—For the first five hundred years after Christ our land was known as Britain. The Gospel was introduced very early, and a Church known as the British Church was soon formed, and flourished. Its origin was due not to Roman,[1] but to Eastern missionaries, who arrived by way of Gaul. Its independence of Roman influence is proved from the rule of its observance of Easter being different from that of Rome, as also its Liturgy, its ritual,

[1] The story of an English king, Lucius, having applied to Eleutherius, Bishop of Rome, for teachers about A.D. 165 is spurious. See Haddan and Stubbs, "Councils," &c., i. 25.

baptism, and the tonsure of its monks. This Church sent three bishops to an important Council of the mother Church (*i.e.*, the Gallic) at Arles in Gaul, A.D. 314, and British bishops are frequently mentioned in the records of that ancient Church far into the seventh century.

SECOND EPOCH.—On the withdrawal of the Roman legions, successive invasions of the heathen Jutes, Saxons, and Angles drove back the native Christian Church from the eastern and midland part of the country to the mountainous districts of the west (Cumberland, Wales, and Cornwall). The rest of Britain was divided by the heathen tribes into seven kingdoms, usually called the Heptarchy. The Angles obtained the largest portion, and from them our country received the name of England. To these *heathen* invaders the ancient British Church did not *at first* fulfil its duty. Defeated and depressed, it devoted its energies to the conversion of Ireland and Scotland, and from these sprang the great missionaries who did so much for the conversion of other lands. St. Columba, an Irish abbot and bishop, founded the monastery of Iona, A.D. 563, and from this missionary centre Bishop Aidan and others in the sixth and seventh centuries converted the whole of England, except the county of Kent; the conversion of that county, and of that only, was accomplished by the Italian mission sent by Gregory, Bishop of Rome, under Augustine, A.D. 597. The

late Bishop Lightfoot said truly, "Not Augustine, but Aidan is the true apostle of England . . . the independence of the Celtic (*i.e.* the British) missions is a patent fact. . . . Rome neither initiated nor controlled these Celtic missions. The missionaries owed allegiance not to the Bishop of Rome, but to the Presbyter-Abbot of Iona."

[St. Patrick is the patron saint of Irish Roman Catholics and yet no support of Modern Romanist doctrines can be gathered from his authenticated writings which are still extant.

He always appeals to Holy Scripture as the only ground and test of Christian doctrine.

As to the doctrine of *Merits* he was not aware of such a notion. Invocation of Saints, Auricular Confession, Purgatory, the Celibacy of the Clergy, and Papal Infallibility (not to mention other Roman tenets) formed no part of his creed.

He was the British Church's first missionary to the sister Island, and well would it have been for Ireland had she remained steadfast to his preaching, instead of being handed over later on spiritually bound and enslaved by Henry II. to Pope Adrian. See Bowen's "Old British Church." Thynne and Jarvis, 1s. 6d.]

LIV

ENGLAND OWES SUBJECTION TO ROME

Q.—Although England was not converted from Rome, is it not true that communications between England and Rome took place early, and did not these communications imply, or lead to, union with and subjection to the Church of Rome?

A.—There is an immense difference between one Church holding friendly *communication* with another and being in *subjection* to that other. The Anglican Churches of Canada, Australia, and the Cape, &c., maintain friendly communications with the Sees of Canterbury and London, and frequently solicit their advice on matters of discipline; sometimes also on the selection of bishops whom they have had consecrated in the mother-city of London; and in other ways they maintain communion with the Church of England; but these communications imply no subjection. This illustrates the nature of the communications which passed between England and Rome up to the Norman conquest. England, with the exception of Kent, was converted by Celtic (British) missionaries, but the struggling

English Christians and their kings could not but recognise the superior learning, intelligence, and influence of Rome, and desire to receive help as to organisation and teachers from a Church at that time so famous and comparatively pure in doctrine.[1] Hence the king of Northumbria requested that Theodore, a monk of the Greek Church, might be consecrated (A.D. 668) at Rome to save time, the native candidate having died before consecration.[2] He was a very able bishop, and united all the English Christians into one Anglo-Saxon Church. He also introduced the Greek system of parochial organisation, divided England into dioceses, raised the education of the clergy, and greatly increased the efficiency of the English Church. But although consecrated at Rome, he would not suffer the Pope to interfere with the English Church, nor did his successors. Wilfrid, Archbishop of York, was excommunicated by a Council of English bishops for upholding the supremacy of the Pope. Archbishop Dunstan, A.D. 970, refused to recognise the Pope's interference in his day. In 1052, Robert the Norman, Archbishop of Canterbury, and Ulf,

[1] It should ever be remembered that the Roman Church of Gregory the Great, and of the sixth and ninth centuries, was very different from the Rome of to-day. Some errors were gradually creeping in, but Transubstantiation, Purgatory, Indulgences, Infallibility of the Pope, Mariolatry, the Seven Sacraments, and denial of the cup to the laity, were unknown at the time of Augustine's mission to England.

[2] Oldroyd on "Continuity of English Church."

another Norman bishop, were deposed for trying to Romanise the Church of England. So far communications existed between the Church of England and Rome, but submission or absorption was distinctly repudiated.

By the Norman conquest, A.D. 1066, the Church of England was gradually drawn into closer connection with Rome. The Norman bishops, forced upon the country by the Conqueror, suffered Rome to encroach upon the liberties of the National Church, so that from the surrender of King John, A.D. 1213, until the dawn of the Reformation, A.D. 1531 (little more than 300 years), the Church was virtually under the dominion of the Papacy—not absorbed, but enthralled—never a part of the Church of Rome, but under her sway; ever restive under her exactions,[1] and never satisfied with a usurpation which had been gained chiefly by diplomacy, false decretals, and superior craft.

But when all this is freely granted, it affords no reason or argument for England's continued subjection to the Church of Rome, or for the reception of her un-Catholic doctrines: rather the reverse. It might as reasonably be argued that a son is bound to persist in all the mischievous courses of an early bad education, in spite of having grown up

[1] The Constitutions of Clarendon (1164), the writings of Grossteste (1250), the Statute of "Præmunire" (1393), are instances of the resistance and repudiation of Roman claims.

to discern their injury and wrong, or that the younger branch of a family is bound to adopt the errors and delinquencies of the senior representative of the family. Surely each member of a family, each branch of the Catholic Church, has a responsibility of its own which it cannot evade or escape. So the Church of England, and the people of England, on the discovery of Rome's errors, and of her determination not to renounce them, pursued the only course open to them, and obeyed God rather than man.[1] Separation had become England's duty if she would be obedient to conscience and to the Bible: the sin of schism lies with the Church of Rome, which had laid down terms of unlawful communion. The Reformation was a return to *primitive* Catholicity and to truth.

[1] No petty arguments of this kind will induce them to resume a yoke which neither they nor their fathers were able to bear.

LV

THE PRESENT CHURCH OF ENGLAND A NEW CHURCH—HER PROPERTY BELONGS TO ROME

Q.—Is there any truth in the statement that the present Church of England is an entirely different Church from the National Church preceding the Reformation, and that the churches, cathedrals, and endowments belong to the Church of Rome?

A.—The present Church of England is indeed in one sense a different Church, as a garden weeded is different from the same garden when weeds, and thistles, and poisonous plants, were allowed to grow in it unchecked; and yet the garden, the soil, the cultivators, and the owners are the same. As well might the identity of England and of her government be questioned as the identity of her Church. Progressive civilisation, in the freedom of the citizens, in the extension of the franchise, in the righteousness and clemency of the laws, have not altered the identity of the English government. Nor has the identity of the English Church been broken or disturbed by her deliverance from Romish usurpation, her restoration to the apostolic teaching, the reforma-

tion of her discipline, and her return to truth and righteousness. This Church was always the "Church of England," so called in the "Magna Charta." She was never the "Church of Rome in England," but always the national "Church of England," though fettered, taxed, and tyrannised over by the Popes in the ages of ignorance. The Reformation made no change in the Church's position, organisation, or inheritance. That Reformation carried with it *all the estates of the realm*—King, Lords, and Commons—the Church and the State. Only 200 of the clergy out of 8000 seceded during the ecclesiastical and national reform which extended over several reigns. The property given to the National Church through the centuries was given as to the "Church of England," and as such she has a continuous and permanent right to its use and benefit, so long as she remains true to the Reformation Settlement.

LVI

RELIGION OF KING HENRY VIII.

Q.—Romanists constantly speak of Henry VIII. as a Roman Catholic "so long as he was chaste," implying that he became a Protestant after the divorce from Catherine, and that he then persecuted his Roman Catholic subjects. Is this a correct account?

A.—Certainly not. Henry VIII. continued to be a strict Romanist all his life. His only quarrel with the Pope was on the question of supremacy, and however much this was hastened by his desire for a divorce from Catherine, it must have arisen on other grounds, as the nation had long been restless under the Pope's exactions and injustice, and had resolved to recover its primitive independence. The Roman Catholic historian Lingard probably sums up Henry's line of action with rigid impartiality: "By law the Catholic and the Protestant were now placed on an equal footing in respect to capital punishment. If to admit the Papal supremacy was treason, *to reject the Papal creed was heresy.* The one could be expiated only by the halter and the knife; the other *led the*

offender to the stake and the faggot. It was in vain that the German reformers pleaded in favour of their English brethren." Referring to his death, the same historian writes, "He (the king) was constantly attended by his confessor, the (Roman Catholic) Bishop of Rochester, heard mass daily in his chamber, and received the communion under one kind."[1] The martyrdom of Anne Askew and many other Protestants testify to the truth of Lingard's statement. The execution of the learned Bishop Fisher was, like that of the godly Sir Thomas More, for refusing to deny the Pope's supremacy over the king and the country, but it was not on the ground of religion. The executions were the deed of a Roman Catholic king who lived and died in the Roman Catholic faith.

[1] Lingard's "History of England," v. 73 *et seq.*

[What Henry VIII. desired to establish in England was really Popery without the Pope.

Bishop Hooper writing to Bullinger in 1546, a year before the king's death, says: "As far as true religion is concerned, idolatry is nowhere in greater vigour. Our king has destroyed the Pope but not Popery." Henry VIII. invoked the Virgin and all saints, and left money for masses to be said for his soul's repose. He was responsible for the "Six Articles" Act, 1539, under which the penalty was death for the denial of the Mass, etc. This cruel Act caused the death of Anne Askew and other Protestants as mentioned above, and remained in force till Henry's death.]

LVII

THE SOVEREIGN THE HEAD OF THE CHURCH

Q.—Romanists charge Protestants with having made the sovereign—whether king or queen—"Head of the Church" in England, as if the Pope's former authority in matters of religion were now exercised by the monarch. Is there any truth in this statement?

A.—There is no reason to believe that even the despotic Henry thought of transferring the Pope's spiritual power to himself. His determination was that the ecclesiastical as well as the temporal affairs of the nation should be freed from the Pope's interference as regarded laws, courts, exactions, and trials. The title which Henry assumed of "Supreme Head of the Church" was admitted by the Roman bishops of his day, with the expressed condition "*quantum per Christi legem licet*" ("so far as is allowed by the law of Christ"). This title was only assumed by Henry VIII., Edward VI., and Queen Mary during the first year of her reign. It was not assumed by the Protestant Queen Elizabeth, nor by any subsequent sovereign. The

title has no legal existence. To allege, therefore, that Queen Victoria is "supreme Head of the Church" is either the result of ignorance or of wilful misrepresentation. The 37th Article, the 10th Homily, and the "Injunctions of Queen Elizabeth," show that the "royal supremacy" does not mean that the sovereign of England is "supreme Head of the Church," but that she is the "supreme governor" over all estates of the realm, ecclesiastical or civil, over all causes, temporal or spiritual, and over all persons within this realm. This supremacy is exercised over Nonconformists and Romanists when occasion requires, as well as over the Church of England.[1] It is a right claimed by every Roman Catholic Government in Europe, and exercised by them, as in the recent expulsion of the Jesuits from France, the suppression of monasteries in Italy and Spain in the present century, the refusal to allow bulls and mandates issued by the Pope to be published without the consent of the ruling power. All Governments find this a needful defence against Papal usurpations; this is the case in Romanist countries even more than in those which are Protestant.

[1] Protestants recognise only One "Head of the Church," even CHRIST.

CONCLUSION

THE examination is now finished of the doctrines of the Church of Rome as taught in her authoritative documents, or involved in practices, allowed without rebuke, in various modern cults.

The tendency of minute investigations is to cramp the mind. Bishop Westcott has well said that the "multiplication of doctrines is perilous to the spiritual life, for it tends to distract our attention, and fixing it upon fragments, dulls the sense of the immeasurable whole."

Let us, therefore, close with a statement of those great principles which are cherished by Protestants, but which appear to be lost sight of by Romanists.

I. Protestants hold that the Gospel is God's provision, by means of redemption, for the reconciliation and renovation of the human family, and that this redemption centres in Christ, so "*that in all things He may hold the* PRIMACY"[1] (Col. i. 18, D.). PRIMACY in the incarnation, for that He (Christ) alone being from all eternity "God of God," has

[1] This primacy is to the *exclusion* of all others. See context referring to creation, &c.

taken man's nature without sin. PRIMACY in the all-embracing efficacy of His sacrifice, "*offered once for all*," so that there is now "*no more offering for sin*." His attitude revealed to us in the Apocalypse as *seated upon a throne*, not standing by an altar, confirms His own sacrificial utterance, "IT IS FINISHED." PRIMACY in love and sympathy towards us, unchanged in His feelings of compassion and tenderness, needing no persuasion, no intervention of priest or angel or intercessor. Cold or ignorant must be that heart which imagines that any creature can love so deeply, intensely, and freely as He, "*Who, though He was rich, for our sakes became poor*," and Who, though "*equal with God, humbled Himself and became obedient unto death, yea, the death of the cross*." Protestants feel that it is blasphemy against the love of Jesus to make its flow dependent upon the intercession of created beings of whatever dignity. PRIMACY also in the honour and glory justly and *exclusively* due to Him, for there can be no lawful deduction from that worship which the creature is capable of giving to the Creator—the sinner to the Saviour. Protestants cannot appropriate "months" to the honour of created beings, for they believe with the Church of the Apocalyptic vision that only the *Lamb Who was slain and redeemed us to God by His blood is worthy of benediction and honour and glory and power for ever and ever* (Apoc. v. 9, 12, 13, D.).

II. Protestants believe in the soul's privilege of direct, personal access to God, having "*fellowship with the Father and with His Son Jesus Christ*" (1 John i. 3, D.). When the soul is truly convinced of sin, when not only its fears are awakened but its guilt presses upon the conscience, that soul feels that absolution cannot be negotiated for by the ordinances of a Church, nor reconciliation with God be obtained by passing through a system of forced penitential discipline. It listens with faith and wonder to the gracious pleading of Jehovah, "*Come now, and let us reason together, saith the Lord; though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be as white as snow; though they be red like crimson, they shall be as wool*" (Isa. i. 18). It hears the personal invitation of the Saviour, "*Come unto* ME . . . *and I will give you rest*"; and to Him it pours out its confessions without fear. That invitation still holds good, for so the inspired exhortation runs, "*Having therefore a great High Priest who hath penetrated the heavens, Jesus the Son of God, let us hold fast our confession . . . let us go with confidence to the throne of grace, that we may obtain mercy, and find grace in seasonable aid*" (Douay), or "*grace to help in time of need*" (R.V.) Heb. iv. 14, 16, and x. 19–22.

Such immediate, direct, and personal access to God in Christ is the privilege of every soul. Rome, without denying it, obscures and nullifies the privilege by a series of intricate rules and ordinances not

prescribed by Christ. Rome says virtually, "There is no salvation without the priest." Protestants say, "There is full salvation in Christ."

III. Protestants believe it to be the will of God that His children should live in the conscious sense of pardoned sin, and of their reconciliation through the blood of Christ. What Jesus said to penitents of old, "*Be of good cheer, thy sins are forgiven thee,*" they hold that He still witnesses by His Spirit in every contrite and believing heart.

Romanists seem to think it presumption to be assured of salvation; they are ever seeking, never attaining to, the profound and blessed sense of acceptance and full forgiveness. Their saints are distinguished by their misery, not by their happiness. Through life, in the death-chamber, in the intermediate state of purgatory, their one prevailing anxiety seems to be how to appease the anger of God, how to escape punishment or lessen its amount, as if Christ had died in vain. Dr. Stone describes Rome's treatment of souls as one of "restraints." Protestants believe that God's treatment is one of grace to make man "a new creature"; of faith's acceptance of a free gift, so that "*there is now no condemnation to them who are in Christ Jesus*" (Rom. viii. 1, D.); of power to enfranchise the soul, "*Sin shall not have dominion over you*"; and of spiritual joy, turning service into perfect freedom, and sur-

rounding all life with an atmosphere of filial obedience and grateful love.

IV. Protestants believe in the right of private judgment, and in the sacredness of its responsibility. They consider that of all the indignities imposed by man on his fellow-man, this denial of the right of private judgment is the greatest. To transfer to another the responsibility of one's faith must enfeeble the moral and spiritual character. A Fellow of a College in Oxford, who followed Newman to Rome, said to the writer when discussing certain Roman doctrines, "Well, if I am wrong, my priest is responsible." Now if men of education can be brought to plead such an excuse, what must be the degradation of the masses? God did not bestow His highest gifts upon His children only for worldly and transient ends, but to guide them to Himself, to enable them freely and consciously, from intelligence and choice, from conviction and personal love, to glorify Him. What did our Lord say? "*Why even of yourselves judge ye not what is right?*" (Luke xii. 57). We are as responsible for our faith as for our actions, and the responsibility in each case rests upon the same principles of private or personal choice, reason, judgment, will. Protestants regard the right of private judgment as a talent given to ALL, to be used seriously, reverently, prayerfully. Romanism, since the declaration of

Papal Infallibility, can logically regard it as only deposited in one man—the Pope. Can this satisfy God and the human conscience? Verily, no.

V. Only one other principle of Protestantism shall be mentioned—its supreme reverence for the Holy Scriptures. It regards the Bible as the Word of God. It finds in it the perfect rule of faith and practice, "So that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an article of the faith, or thought requisite or necessary to salvation."[1] It further holds that it is the Divine intention that it should be placed within the reach of all God's creatures—that to withhold it is a wrong to man and a dishonour to God.

Let it be thankfully acknowledged that many Roman ecclesiastics profess no longer to discourage the reading of the Bible among their members in the Anglo-Saxon races. Englishmen have read the Bible for centuries, and they will not listen to a religion which forbids its use. May the concession be made authoritative by the promulgation of a Bull which shall abrogate existing restrictions and prohibitions:[2] may the present Pope commend its study in his next Encyclical, and appoint a "congregation" or commission to prepare copies of the

[1] Article VI. of Church of England.

[2] See pp. 83, 84.

whole Bible in the vernacular for all countries and mission stations where there are members of the Roman Church. Such an *authoritative* step pronounced *ex cathedra* will alone inspire confidence, for it is well known that mere relaxations of rules are liable to be withdrawn.

Meanwhile, let every Romanist seize the present opportunity. Let him at once read the New Testament in large portions, not in mere verses and fragments, that he may gain wide and comprehensive views of the Saviour's teaching and of His redeeming work for us men and for our salvation. Let him read a Gospel or an Epistle at a sitting, and question himself as to the intention of the writer, the subjects treated of, its teaching as to pardon, reconciliation, and a holy life. The Bereans (Acts xvii. 11, D.) are pronounced "noble" because "*they received the Word with all eagerness, daily searching the Scriptures whether these things* (preached by apostles) *were so.*" So to the inquiring Romanist let me say—Read the Bible with reference to certain topics and doctrines which you have hitherto received without inquiry or heard of without attention. Read the letters of St. Paul and St. Peter, the reputed founders of the Christian Church in Rome. Imitate the Bereans. "Search" as to what allusions are made in these apostolic letters to the Primacy of Peter, or to the cult of the Virgin Mary, or of St. Joseph. Examine

them as to the Articles in the Creed of Pius IV.:—auricular confession, masses, purgatory, indulgences, and the like. Compare the terms of reconciliation laid down by Apostles in such Epistles as to the Romans, Ephesians, Colossians, with those exacted by your Church. Take the few oft-quoted texts by which the Papacy has been defended, and see if they will bear the strain. Observe them honestly, and notice how many refer to the weaknesses and frailties of St. Peter: how those which allude to his gifts and privileges were equally shared by his brother apostles. Study, as in duty bound, the Epistles of St. Peter. Mark the portrait of the chastened, purified, and matured Apostle, *given by himself* when taught by the Holy Spirit, claiming no other priesthood for himself than that of the Christian laity to whom he wrote (1 Peter ii. 5); and contrast this portrait with the perverted and worldly picture[1] entitled "St. Peter enthroned as Pope," arrayed in pontifical robes, chasuble, orfrey, and tiara! Which is the true Peter?

And as you read this Bible—not as a mere tradition, or a *livre de pieté*, but, as it is in truth, the Word of God—pause every now and then, take breath, meditate, bend the knee in prayer, ask with the Psalmist, "*Open Thou mine eyes that I may see the wondrous things of thy Law*" (Ps. cxix. 18). Question solemnly with yourself whether the

[1] By Gran Vasco.

religion which the Church of Rome teaches corresponds to the religion which the Son of God designed for men when He offered up Himself on Calvary as "a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world" (1 John ii. 2), and reflect that your state in eternity may depend upon your decision and your reply NOW.

MEANING OF WORDS NOT IN GENERAL USE

APOCALYPSE.—The title in the Douay version for the Book of the Revelation.

BULL.—A weighty and formal document issued by the Pope, and so called from the bulla, or round leaden seal, attached to it. Papal decrees are given in this form. The title of the Bull is taken from the first Latin words of the document.

CANON.—See p. 95.

CONCOMITANCE.—See p. 128.

CONDIGNITY.—Worthiness to merit.

CONGREGATION.—A committee of Roman Cardinals presiding over a special department in the Roman Church, *e.g.*, over Foreign Missions, Rites and Ceremonies, prohibited Books, Indulgences, &c.

CURIA.—The body of functionaries who surround the Roman Pontiff and form the Papal Court.

DOULEIA.—The degree of veneration given to saints and relics.

ENCYCLICAL.—A letter proceeding from the Pope addressed to all bishops in communion with Rome in matters relating to that Church.

EX CATHEDRÂ.—Literally, "from the chair" on which the Pope sits, and thus "officially, authoritatively."

HOLY OFFICE.—The Office of the Inquisition.

HYPOSTATIC.—See p. 128.

HYPERDOULEIA.—The worship given to the Virgin Mary as above that given to saints.

INDEX EXPURGATORIUS.—The list of books from which certain passages were to be expunged as faulty.

INDEX PROHIBITORIUS.—The list of books prohibited from being read by Romanists.

MASS.—See p. 142, note.

PAPACY.—See p. 3, note.

PENANCE.—See p. 112, note.

TRIDENTINE.—From Tridentum, the Latin for Trent, where the famous Council was held; belonging to the Council of Trent.

VATICAN.—The residence of the Pope at Rome; used frequently as equivalent to the Papacy or Papal government.

VATICAN COUNCIL.—See p. 53.

TEXTS EXPLAINED.

Gen. iii. 15, p. 236
„ xviii., p. 266
„ xxxii., p. 266
Mal. i. 11, p. 149
Luke i. 28, pp. 58, 256
John vi. 53, 63, pp. 134, 135
„ xvi. 13, p. 37
John xvii. 21, p. 33
„ xx. 21–23, p. 120
1 Cor. x. 16, p. 136
„ x. 21, p. 149
„ xi. 26, p. 167
Jas. v. 14, p. 110

INDEX

Absolution, 120
Accidents, 127
Adaptation to English feeling, 198, 358
Addis, W. E., editor of R. C. Dictionary, 130, 336
After death, 195, 205
Aidan, Bishop, 385
Alban's, St., Abbey, 80
Albigenses, 74, 287
Altar, 146, 149, 154
Ambrose, St., 16, 239
Angels, Old Testament, 266; worship of, 264
Anselm, 189
Aosta's, Duke of, marriage, 110
Apocalypse, 405
Apocrypha, 96
Aquinas, 198, 240, 270
Arius, 40, 51
Articles, XXXIX., 98, 106, 141, 162, 190, 196, 201
Assumption of Virgin Mary, 231
Athanasius, St., 40
Atonement, 179, 183
Attitude of Rome towards English Protestantism, 188, 270, 358
Attrition, 113
Augustine, St., Mission of, 383
Augustine, St. (of Hippo), 15, 65 108, 112, 138, 152, 193, 219, 220
Augustulus, 69
Auricular confession, 114

Bagshawe, J. B., 7, 91, 94, &c.
Baptism, 108
Baronius' account of Popes of 10th century, 50
Basil, St., 105, 185, 205
Bellarmine, 6, 198, 271
Benson, Archbishop, 363
Berengarius, 48
Bernard, St., 16, 185, 208, 240
Bernardine of Sienna, 225
Bible, alleged uncertainty of interpretation, 57; canon of, 95; recent permission to read, with indulgences, 361; Rome's restricted use of vernacular, 88
Bitterness of Rome, 363
Black Image at Montserrat, 272
Bonaventura, 24, 270, 271
,, Psalter of the Virgin, 224
Bossuet, 46, 118
Breviary, 86, 222
Browne, Bishop Harold, 182, 206
Bull, definition of, 405
,, Unam Sanctum, 22, 48
Butler's "Analogy," 4

CAJETAN, Cardinal, 98, 117, 240
Calvin, 182
Canon of Scripture, 95; what it means, 95
Catechism, 163
Catholic Church, 64; Dictionary, 113, 129, &c.; meanings of, 62; tracts, 381
Catholicity, Rome's claim to, 61
Charlemagne, 71
Charles V., 80
Christina of Spain, 173
Chrysostom, St., 15, 17, 89, 138, 185, 206
Church property, 390
Clement of Alexandria, 89
Clement of Rome, 185
Communion in one kind, 166
,, of Saints, 212, 295
Complexity of the Roman faith, 296
Concomitance, definition, 128
Condignity, 189
Confession, auricular, 114
Confirmation, 108
Congregation, 405
Conscience, 340
Constantine the Great, 152
Continuity of English Church, 390, 391
Contrition, 113
Conversion of England, 383
Converts from Rome, 336
Cosin, Bishop, 58
Council of Basle (A.D. 1431), 240
,, Chalcedon (A.D. 451), 68
,, Clermont (A.D. 1095), 168
,, Constance (A.D. 1415), 169, 240
,, Constantinople I. (A.D. 381), 68
,, Ephesus I. (A.D. 431), 244
Council of Florence (A.D. 1439), 48
,, Nicæa I. (A.D. 325), 29, 51
,, Nicæa II. (A.D. 787), 232
,, Laodicea (A.D. cir. 360), 267
,, Lateran IV. (A.D. 215), 124, 139, 170
,, Trent (A.D. 1545), 79, 82, 99, 126
,, Vatican (A.D. 1870), 53
Counsels of perfection, 190
Cranmer, Archbishop, 365
Creed, Pius IV., 81
Curia, 23
Cyprian, St., 14, 104; misquoted 15
Cyril, St., of Alexandria, 16
,, Jerusalem, 89

DANTE'S estimate of Popes, 24, 51
Decretals, false, of Isidore, 22, 72
Defective views of Christ, 162, 202, 246, 249, 279, 284, 296
Defender of the Faith, F.D., 381
Definition of Romish terms, 405
Denial of cup to the laity, 166
Development, 320
Di Bruno, 188, 197, 212, 220, 236
Dimock, Rev. N., 142, 147, 162, 165
Disunion among Romanists, 29, 31
Divisions, Rome author of, 30
Döllinger, Dr. von, 336
Donation of Constantine, spurious, 72
Donatists, 28
Douleia, 214

ENCYCLICAL, 405
English Church independent of Rome, 387; subjection to Rome, 386

Enthronement of St. Peter, 403
Erasmus, 88
Eucharist, the, 125; Protestant view of, 158; sacrifice of the, 140
Ex cathedrâ, 405
Exclusive Catholicity, 61
Extreme unction, 110

Failures of Protestantism, 369; of Romanism as to truth, 37; of Romanism as to unity, 33
Faith, 122, 179; by, alone, 182
Fid. Def. on coin of the realm, 381
Firmilian of Cæsarea, 18
Fisher, Bishop, 198, 206, 393
France, condition of, 337, 374
French Revolution, 376
Forged Decretals, 72
Forgiveness, God's perfect, 208
Froude's "Council of Trent," 80

Gibbons, Cardinal, 135, 360
Gladstone, W. E., 343
Glories of Mary, 227
Good in Romanism, 353
Greek Church, 22, 201, 206; separation of, 30, 72
Gregory St. Nazianzen, 205

Hades, 195, 213
Half Communion, 166
Harper, Father, 241
Henry II. of France, 82
Henry VIII., 392
Heresies of Popes, 48
Hiereus, 155
Hildegard, a prophetess, 24
Holy Communion, true doctrine, 158
Holy Face, cult of the, 314
Holy Office, 61, 405
Holy Spirit, 38; honoured by Protestants, 39
Homily on repentance, 117; on sacraments, 108, 164
Hooker, 164
Hussites, 169
Hutton, A. W., 336
Hyperdouleia, 214
Hypostatic union, 128

Image at Montserrat, 272
„ worship, 269
Immaculate Conception, 236
Immoral Popes, 50, 51, 79
Incarnation, the, 240
Index Expurgatorius, 406
„ Prohibitorius, 31, 87
Indulgences, 280; arguments for, 293; uncertainty of, 289
Infallibility of the Pope, 43; *à priori*, 54
Inquisition, the, 29, 367
Intention, 298
Interdict, 23
Intermediate state, 195, 205
Interpolations, 15
Invocation of saints, 210, 217; meaning of, 216; of angels, 264
Irenæus, St., 205
Isidore, false Decretals of, 22, 72

Jenkins, Canon, 92, 102, 201
Jerome, St., 18, 98, 105, 189, 204, 219
Jesuits, 147, 334, 343, 363, 367, 376
Jewel, Bishop, 160
John, King of England, 73
Joseph, St., invocation of, 217, 307
Josephus, 98
Jovian, 68

Justification, 177, 179; misrepresented, 183
Justin Martyr, 205

Keenan's Catechism, 166, 188, 254, 264, 265, 278
Klein, L. M. B., 336.

Lactantius on the Bible, 92
Lasserre, 87, 245
Latin Races, 337
Latreia, 214
L'Épicier, 286, 290
Lewis IX., King of France, 74
Lightfoot, Bishop, 155
Liguori, 115
Lingard's History, 392
Littledale, Dr., 209
Liturgy, Roman, 86
Living voice, Rome's, 51, 59, 237, 246, 298, 301, 347; the true, 351
Lord's Supper, the, 158
Loreto, 315
Lourdes, 316
Lucius, 383
Luther, 182, 283, 377

Maccabees, Book of, 204
Malachi's prophecy, 149
Manning, Cardinal, 32, 343
Mariolatry, 222; Rome's apology for, 242; safeguards against, 250
Martyrs, of the Reformation, 157, 365; Rome's so-called, 366
Mary, the Virgin, Encyclicals relating to, 235; in the Eucharist, 230; prayers to, 227, 229; Protestant view of, 255; shares the attributes of Christ, 231, 234
Mass, definition of, 140, 142; doctrine of, 145; traffic, 172
Matrimony, 110
Melchizedec, 146, 159
Merit, 187
Milner, Dr., 367
Miracles, stupendous, 129
Miraculous medal, 310
Missal, 222
Missions to the heathen, 88, 373
Mohammedanism, 71
More, Sir Thomas, 198, 393
Morals, 330, 332; and sanctity, 325
Mother of God, 243

New devotions, 306
Newman, Cardinal, 44, 45
Norman Conquest, 387, 388
No salvation out of Rome, 22, 61
Numbers of Romanists, 337

Old Catholics, 338
Onesiphorus, 207
Orders, 110
Origen, 14, 105

Papacy, the, 3; rise of, 66
Papal supremacy, 17
Paradise, 195, 213
Passover, the, 132
Paul, St., at Rome, 67
Penance, 112
Pepin, 71
Persecution, Roman, 74, 157
Peter, St., at Rome, 67
Philip Augustus, 74
Philip the Fair, 74
Philo, 98
Pilgrimages, 315
Pontifex Maximus, 153, 381
Pope Adrian IV., 72
,, Alexander VI., 51, 79

Pope Alexander VIII., 299
„ Benedict IV., 175
„ Benedict XIV., 198
„ Boniface, VIII., 48
„ Celestine, 18
„ Clement VII., 49
„ Eugenius, 48
„ Gelasius, 48, 168
„ Gregory the Great, 19, 22, 69, 153, 239, 387
„ Gregory VII. (Hildebrand), 24, 72
„ Gregory IX., 24
„ Honorius, 47
„ Innocent III., 22, 58, 73
„ Julius II., 80, 315
„ Leo I., 69, 168
„ Leo III., 71
„ Leo X., 80
„ Leo XII., 84
„ Leo XIII., 59, 235, 316, 361
„ Liberius, 40, 47
„ Nicholas I., 22, 48, 72
„ Nicholas II., 48
„ Pascal II., 168, 170
„ Paul III., 80
„ Paul IV., 80
„ Pius IV., 79, 81
„ Pius V., 160
„ Pius IX., 56, 235, 236
„ Sixtus IV., 200, 226, 315
„ Sixtus V., 287
„ Stephen, 18, 71
„ Urban II., 287
„ Urban VI., 49
„ Vigilius, 47
„ Zachary, 71
Popes of the Reformation period, 79
Popular Roman fallacies, 379
Prayers for the dead, 206
Priesthood of Christ, 158; sacrificial, 154
Primacy of St. Peter, 6; of his successors, 13
Propitiation, 160; completed by Christ, 145; in the Mass, 141, 143
Protestantism, principles of, 396
Psalter of Bonaventura, 224
Purgatory, 195; nature of, 198; duration of, 199; no evidence for, 203

Queen Elizabeth, Bull against, 287
Queen the Head of the Church, 394

Real Presence, localised, 129; spiritual, 164
Reason, 130
Reason and conscience stifled, 340
Reformation, causes of, 30; principles, 396; supposed immoral effects of, 375
Relics, 276
Repentance, 113
Rewards, 192
Rise and growth of the Papacy, 66
Romanism, is it increasing? 333
Roman claims to the subjection of England, 386
Roman martyrs, 365
Roman Ritual, the, 223
Rosary of Mary, 229
Royal supremacy, 394
Rule of faith, 85, 106
Ryder, Father, 91, 92, 197, 200, &c.

Sacraments, definition of, 107; of the Gospel, 108; signs not the things, 137; seven, 107; the five so called, 109
Sacred Heart of Jesus, cult of the, 310; of Mary, cult of the, 313

Sacrifice of the Mass, 140; primitive application, 151; Roman definition, 143
Sacrificing priesthood, 125, 154
Saints, Roman, 211; invocation of, 216; New Testament, 211
Salmon, Dr. G., on infallibility, 46, 50
Sanctification, 177; inseparable from justification, 181
Sanctity, 325
Satisfaction, 117; transferable, 291
Scapulars, 199, 229
Scripture, Canon of, 95; sufficiency of, 105
Secessions from Rome, recent, 336, 338, 339
Separation of morals from devotions, 330
Septuagint, 97
Seven Sacraments, 107
Simplicity of the Gospel, 20, 158, 248, 251, 296
Solidarity of the Church, 295
Spain, present condition of, 339; Reformed Church of, 370
Spurious documents, 22, 72
Substance, 127
Supererogation, works of, 189
Superstitions, modern, 305
Swete, Dr., 186, 189, 220

TALMUD, 98
Taylor, Jeremy, Bishop, 114
Temporal sovereignty, 21
Tertullian, 138, 205, 208, 214
Texts explained, 406
Theory of the Papacy, 3; the foundation of, 6
Tillotson, Bishop, 52
Tradition, 101
Traffic in Masses, 172; decree concerning, 174
Traitors or martyrs? 366
Transubstantiation, 125
Trent, Council of, 79; its bishops, 82; without authority, 81
Truth, Rome's failure in teaching, 37

UNITY, Christ's prayer for, 33; Rome's failure, 27; Rome's idea of, 28; in Rome not real, 32
Unknown tongue, 255

VALENS, 69
Valentinian, 69
Vatican Council, 53
Vaughan, Cardinal, 56, 217, 333
Victor Emmanuel, 25
Vulgate, Latin, 87, 98

WATTS, Dr., 137
Westcott, Bishop, 38, 121, 146
Western schism, 49
Wiseman, Cardinal, 271
Wyclif, 75

XIMENES, Cardinal, 99

ZEAL of the Roman Church, 333

WORKS ON ROMANISM

FROM

THYNNE & JARVIS'S LIST.

Papal Infallibility. In the Light of Holy Scripture and of History. By Rev. T. A. Beckett. Cloth, 1s 6d net.

Manual of the Roman Controversy. A complete refutation of the Creed of Pope Pius IV. By Rev. R. P. Blakeney, D.D. Cloth, 1s 6d net. 27th thousand.

Popery in its Social Aspect. Its immorality and intolerance. By Rev. R. P. Blakeney, D.D. Cloth, 1s 6d net.

Forgotten Heroes, or Faith on the Battlefield. By Rev. C. J. Casher, D.D. Cloth, 2s net. Half Leather, 4s 6d net. Contains a vivid account of Italian and Spanish Martyrs and the Waldensian Church.

Delineation of Roman Catholicism. Drawn from the authentic and acknowledged Standards of the Church of Rome by the Rev. Charles Elliott, D.D. With Suppt. by the Rev. W. H. Rule, D.D. Fourth Edition, large 8vo, 800 pp., cloth, gilt, 7s 6d net.

The Searchlight of St. Hippolytus. The Papacy in the Light of Discovery. By Rev. Parke P. Flourney, D.D. Introduction by Prof. W. W. Moore, D.D. Cloth, gilt, 5s net.

Foxe's Book of Martyrs. Illustrated. Cloth, gilt, 3s net.

Rome's Tactics to subvert and ruin Protestant Churches and States. By Dean Goode. Edited by Rev. E. W. Bullinger, D.D. 50th thousand. Cloth, 1s net.

The Worship of St. Philomena. A Roman Catholic Cult. By Rev. E. D. Cree, M.A. Cloth, 1s 6d net.

Is the Roman Church Holy? A religious and ethical account of the lives of the Popes. By H. A. Henderson. Cloth, 2s net.

Our Sacrifice of Praise and Thanksgiving. The teaching of the Church of Rome, the Primitive Church and the Church of England on the Lord's Supper. By Rev. P. C. Ingrouille, B.D. Cloth, gilt, 3s 6d net.

From Rome to Christ. The soul history of R. Le Comte. Translated by Rev. C. L. Isaacson. Cloth, 1s 6d net.

Twice Born Souls. Stories of Conversion. By Rev. Claud Field. Cloth, 1s 6d net.

Judge Fairly. A Reply to Dr. Faa di Bruno's "Catholic Belief." By Rev. Wm. Lockett. Second Edition. Cloth, 2s 6d net.

The Jesuits. A History of their open and secret proceedings —abridged from Greisinger's Work by Rev. John R. Palmer. Cloth, 2s net.

Birds without a Nest. A Tale of Roman Oppression in Peru. By Mrs. C. M. Turner. Illustrated. Cloth, 2s net.

The Jesuits in Great Britain. A Historical Enquiry. By Walter Walsh. Cloth, gilt, 5s net.

The Fallacy of Sacramental Confession. By Rev. Chas. Neil. Cloth, 1s net.

Paganry, Popery, Pillage. By "Constantine Labarum." A Historical Exposure of Rome's Adoption of Pagan Rites—the Papal Claims and Papal Merchandise. Cloth, gilt, 5s net.

Truth or Error? Roman Teaching in the Light of Holy Scripture and Church History. By Rev. John R. Palmer. Cloth, gilt, 3s 6d net.

The Advance of Rome. A black thunder-cloud on the horizon of the Church of Christ. By D. M. Panton, B.A. 2nd Edition. Paper boards, 1s net.

The Counter-Reformation in Europe. From A.D. 1558 to 1648. By Canon A. R. Pennington, M.A. Cloth, gilt, 3s 6d net.

The Roman Church and Heresy. A Historical Survey of the History of the St. Bartholomew Massacre, 1572, and after. Illustrated with copies of Roman Medals and Drawings. By C. Poyntz Stewart, M.A. Paper covers, 2s 6d net. Cloth, 3s 6d net.

The Church of Rome and her Barriers against Unity and Union. By an aged Christian. Cloth, 1s 6d net.

Light from Old Times. Being the Lives and Times of British Reformers and Martyrs. By Bishop J. C. Ryle. With portrait illustrations. Cloth, gilt, 5s net. With gilt edges, 6s 6d net.

Cautions for the Times. A Series of Essays on the Roman Controversy. Edited by Archbishop Whateley. Cloth, gilt, 5s net.

Union with Rome. The Papal Church and the Book of Revelation. By Bishop Christopher Wordsworth. 13th Edition. Cloth, 2s net.

Count Campello. An Autobiography. With his reasons for leaving the Church of Rome. Cloth, 2s net.

Life of Giovanni Diodati. Italian Reformer and Translator of the Bible. By Maria Betts. Portrait, Cloth, 1s 6d net.

Life of Galeazzio Caracciolo. An Illustrious Italian Sixteenth Century Reformer. By Maria Betts. Cloth, 2s net.

The Roman Mass, and the English Church. By Rev. N. Dimock. With notes and a valuable Appendix of Quotations. Cloth, 1s 6d net.

The Faith once for all delivered unto the Saints. A People's Handbook on Roman Doctrine. By Rev. R. Middleton. Introduction by Prebendary H. E. Fox. Fourth Impression. Paper boards, 1s net.

Great Truths Simply Explained in the light of Holy Scripture. By Rev. W. St. Clair Tisdale, D.D. Third Edition. Paper boards, 1s net.

Analysis of Waterland on the Eucharist. By Rev. H. W. Greswell, M.A. Cloth, 1s 6d net.

Bishop Ridley on the Lord's Supper. Reprinted with Introduction, notes and appendices and Prefaced by a Life of the Writer, by Handley C. G. Moule, D.D., Bishop of Durham. Portrait and 7 illustrations. Cloth, gilt, 5s net.

The Image of a Cross in Pagan and Roman Symbolism. By Canon T. C. O'Connor, M.A. Cloth, 1s net.

Two Treatises on the Church. By T. Jackson, D.D. and Bishop R. Sanderson. With a letter of Bishop Cosin on the validity of the Orders of the Reformed Churches. Cloth, 2s 6d net.

By the Sad Sea Waves. A story illustrative of the dangers of the Confessional. By Evangeline Marsh. Boards, 1s 6d net.

Piers the Protestant and the Jesuits. By Berwen Breeth. Paper Cover, 1s 3d net.

The Priesthood. Christian and Anti-Christian. By Eliz. Stringer. Paper Cover, 1s net.

St. Austin's Cliff. A tale of Monastic Life and the perils of Romanism. By B. Sandwith. Cloth, 1s 6d net.

The Priest and His Vestments, or the Vicar's Discussion. By Wm. James Stewart. Preface by Sir Robert Anderson. Four illustrations. Cloth, 2s net.

Apostolical Succession, or the Constitution of a Christian Church. By Archbishop Whately. Cloth, 2s net.

The Book of Bertram. (Monk of Corbie, A.D. 840) on the Body and Blood of the Lord. Translated by Archdeacon W. F. Taylor, D.D. Cloth, 2s net.
(This Work led both Ridley and Cranmer to reject the doctrine of Transubstantiation.)

The Trial of Anti-Christ, alias the Man of Sin, alias the Bishop of Rome, for HIGH TREASON against the SON OF GOD. Cloth, 1s net.

PAMPHLETS ON ROMANISM.

DEBATES BETWEEN ROMANISTS AND PROTESTANTS

Caxton Hall Debate. The Church of Christ. Third ed. 4d.
Comments on the above Debate. Rev. T. C. Hammond. 2d.
Brighton Debate. The Open Bible. Is it a Blessing or a Curse? 4d.
Wimbledon Debate. Did Jesus Christ found His Church on S. Peter? 6d.

Purgatory. Where is it? What is it? Rev. E. K. Elliott. 3d.
Thoughts on St. John vi. Rev. E. K. Elliott. 6d.
Spiritual Aspects of the Roman Controversy. Canon Garratt. 4d.
Shall we tolerate the Jesuits? H. A. Henderson. 3d.
The British Envoy at the Vatican. Michael McCarthy. 2d.
The Ne Temere Decree on Protestant Marriages. 3d.

"LIGHT FROM OLD TIMES" REPRINTS.

No. 1. James II. and the Seven Bishops. Bishop J. C. Ryle. Stiffened paper covers, 6d.
No. 2. Bishops Latimer and Ridley. Reformers and Martyrs. Bishop J. C. Ryle. Illustrated. 9d.
No. 3. Why were our Reformers Burned? Bishop J. C. Ryle. 4d. Portrait of Cranmer.

Protestant Catechism. Rev. R. P. Blakeney. 98th thousand. 3d.
The Growth of Rome. D. M. Panton. 1d.
Henry IV. at Canossa. His Victory. 6d.
The Martyr of Stockholm (Translated from Strindberg). 9d.
The Meaning of the Mass. 20th thousand. 1d.
Roman Pledges. Rev. Chas. Stirling. 2d.
Prayers for the Dead. Rev. C. H. H. Wright. 2d.
The Priest in the Church. Charles Ford. 2d.
Simple Catechism for Young Protestants. 1d.
Archbishop Tait and Bishop Wilberforce on Confession. 2d.
The Roman Mass v. Holy Communion. 90th thousand. 1d.
Does Rome Persecute? Rev. W. T. McCormick. 1d.
Papal Infallibility. Rev. N. F. Duncan. 1d.
Jesuit Scheme to Convert England. C. H. Collette. 3d.
Rome's Illegal Territorial Titles in England. C. H. Collette. 6d.
What is Truth? The doctrines of Romanists and the Word of God. By E. A. Rawlence. 6d.
Praying for the Departed. Rev. J. Warren, D.D. 1d.
Prayers for the Dead. W. Prescott Upton. 2d.
Prayers for the Dead. Rev. C. H. H. Wright, D.D. 2d.
Carrying the Host. 1d.
Captives in the Fortress of Despair. 2d.
Auricular Confession. Rev. G. S. Karney. 6d.
Immaculate Conception of the Virgin. Rev. John R. Palmer. 6d.
Re-Union with the Church of Rome. Rev. T. J. Pulvertaft. 1d.
How Rome treats the Bible. Walter Walsh. 2d.
What is Idolatry? Rev. W. H. K. Soames. 3d.
A Chat about the Catacombs. Rev. Wm. C. Procter. 3d.
Reservation. W. Prescott Upton. 4d.
Fetters: "How Christ set me free." Mrs. K. Freeman. 2d.
Why this Controversy? Mrs. K. Freeman, 42 pp. & cover. 4d.

CHAS. J. THYNNE & JARVIS, LTD.
Whitefriars Street, London, E.C.4.

Crown 8vo, xii. and 197 pp. Cloth gilt, **3/6** *net; postage 4d.*

TRUTH OR ERROR?

OR

ROMISH TEACHING IN THE LIGHT OF HOLY SCRIPTURE AND CHURCH HISTORY

BY THE

REV. JOHN R. PALMER

AUTHOR OF "THOUGHTS ON OUR LORD'S TEMPTATION," "BURDEN-BEARING; AND OTHER SACRED STUDIES," ETC., ETC.

CONTENTS

PAPAL INFALLIBILITY—TRANSUBSTANTIATION OPPOSED TO REASON, FAITH, AND SCRIPTURE—THE IMMACULATE CONCEPTION OF THE BLESSED VIRGIN MARY—MARIOLATRY—THE GOSPEL AND ROMANISM—ROME AND CONCILIAR FREEDOM—ENGLAND AND ROME.

REVIEWS

"This collection of essays on different aspects of the Roman question is dedicated to the Rev. Chancellor Lias in gratitude for earnest and practical sympathy with the aims and witness of the Reformation.

"The author has read widely and thought much on the leading errors of the Church of Rome, and he writes to open the eyes of English Churchmen to the doctrinal and moral evils of the system. The book is valuable on account of the pointed quotations from distinguished writers, and its readable style must make it welcome to many who desire to know what Rome teaches."—*The Church Gazette.*

"Is a firm and earnest protest against the errors which are now undermining the Reformation truth in the Church of England. Nothing could be more conclusive."—*The News.*

"This book is excellent. It comprises seven chapters. Papal Infallibility, Transubstantiation, The Immaculate Conception, and Mariolatry all come in for careful, critical and decisive treatment. . . . We heartily commend the book to all who love their Church and protest against the ousting of Scripture."—*The Churchman.*

Printed by C. J. Farncombe & Sons, Ltd., 30 Imperial Buildings, Ludgate Circus, E.C.4